

**The Ramakrishna Mission
Institute of Culture Library**

Presented by

Dr. Baridbaran Mukerji

RMICL-8

17936



HISTORY
OF
THE ENGLISH REVOLUTION
OF 1640:

FROM THE ACCESSION OF CHARLES I.
TO HIS DEATH.

BY F. GUIZOT
AUTHOR OF "HISTOIRE DE LA CIVILISATION EN FRANCE,"
ETC. ETC.

TRANSLATED BY WILLIAM HAZLITT, ESQ.

LONDON:
H. G. BOHN, YORK STREET, COVENT GARDEN.
MDCCLVI

**J. SAVILL AND EDWARDS, PRINTERS, CHANDOS-STREET,
COVENT-GARDEN**

| | |
|-----------|---------|
| RMIC | |
| Acc. No. | 17936 |
| | 942.062 |
| Class No, | G41 |
| Date | |
| St. Card | |
| Class. | ✓ |
| Cat. | mg |
| Ex. C. r | ✓ |
| Cl. 31 | mg |

David Aaron Hunt
1 College Row. Cambridge

ADVERTISEMENT.

THE full explanation given by M. Guizot, in the following preface, of the nature of his work, renders any remark on my part unnecessary. I will therefore merely state that in translating it my desire has been to render the author's meaning as nearly as possible in his own style; whether I have succeeded in this object, it is for others to determine. As to the books, documents, and speeches quoted, I have in all cases gone back to the original sources consulted by the author, and given the *ipsissima verba* of the respective writer or speaker. M. Guizot, in setting forth his authorities, refers to his own edition of the *Memoirs* relative to our Revolution (a most valuable publication); the references in my translation are to the best English edition of each work cited. The ample index now given is an entirely new feature, and will, I trust, be accepted as an important one.

WILLIAM HAZLITT.

CONTENTS.

| | |
|---|--------|
| Translator's Advertisement | p. iii |
| Author's Preface to the First Edition | ix |
| Author's Advertisement to the Edition of 1841 | xxiii |

| | |
|----------------------------------|------|
| INTRODUCTORY DISCOURSE | p. 1 |
|----------------------------------|------|

BOOK THE FIRST.

1625—1629.

Accession of Charles the First to the throne—State and disposition of England—Meeting of the first parliament—Spirit of liberty manifested therein—Its dissolution—First attempts at arbitrary government—Their bad success—Second parliament—Impeachment of the Duke of Buckingham—Dissolution of parliament—Ill administration of Buckingham—Third parliament—Petition of rights—Prorogation of parliament—Murder of Buckingham—Second session of the third parliament—Fresh causes of public discontent—The king's displeasure—dissolution of the third parliament p. 1

BOOK THE SECOND.

1629—1640.

Intentions of the king and his council—Prosecution of the leading members of parliament—Apparent apathy of the country—Struggle of the ministry and court—The queen—Strafford—Laud—Want of cohesion in, and discredit of government—Civil and religious tyranny—Its effects on the different classes of the nation—Trial of Prynne, Burton, and Bastwick—Of Hampden—Insurrection of Scotland—First war with the Scots—Peace of Berwick—Short parliament of 1640—Second war with Scotland—Its bad success—Convocation of the long parliament . . . p. 24

BOOK THE THIRD.

1640—1642.

Opening of parliament—It seizes on power—State of religious and political parties—The king's concessions—Negotiations between the king and the leaders of parliament—Conspiracy in the army—Strafford's trial and death—The king's journey to Scotland—Insurrection in Ireland—Debate on the remonstrance—The king's return to London—Progress of the revolution—Riots—Affair of the five members—The king leaves London—The queen's departure for the continent—Affair of the militia—Negotiations—The king fixes his residence at York—Both parties prepare for war—The king refused admission to Hull—Vain attempts at conciliation—Formation of the two armies p. 86

BOOK THE FOURTH.

1642—1643.

Breaking out of the civil war—The king raises his standard at Nottingham—Battle of Edgehill—Alarms in London—Fight of Brentford—Attempts at negotiation—Character of the civil war—The queen returns from the continent—Negotiations at Oxford—Distrust of the Earl of Essex—Internal dissensions of parliament—Royalist conspiracy in the city—Death of Hampden—Repeated defeats of the parliament—Its energy—Efforts of the partisans of peace in parliament—Project of the king to march upon London—The project defeated—Siege of Gloucester—Raised by Essex—Battle of Newbury—Death of Lord Falkland—Alliance of Parliament with the Scots—Triumphant return of Essex to London. p. 161

BOOK THE FIFTH.

1643—1645.

State of parties and rise of the independents—Proceedings of the court at Oxford—The king concludes a truce with the Irish—Parliament at Oxford—Death of Pym—Campaign of 1644—Battle of Marston-moor—Reverses of Essex in Cornwall—Misunderstanding between the presbyterian leaders and Cromwell—Attempts at negotiation—Self-denying ordinance—Trial and death of Laud—Negotiations at Uxbridge—Reorganization of the parliamentary army—Fairfax appointed general—Essex gives in his resignation p. 208

BOOK THE SIXTH.

1645—1646.

Formation of the army of the independents—Cromwell retains his command—

Campaign of 1645—Alarms of Parliament—Battle of Naseby—The parliament seizes and publishes the king's private correspondence—Decline of the royalist party in the west—Flight and anxiety of the king—Montrose's victory in Scotland—The king attempts to join him, but without success—Defeat of Montrose—The king's stay at Newark—He returns to Oxford and seeks to renew negotiations with the parliament—The parliament rejects the overture—New elections—The king treats with the insurgent Irish—The treaty discovered—Defeat of the last royalist troops—The king escapes from Oxford and seeks refuge in the Scottish camp p. 268

BOOK THE SEVENTH.

1646—1647.

Anxiety and intrigues of the independents—The king's stay at Newcastle—

He rejects the proposals of parliament—The parliament negotiates with the Scots, to induce them to give up the king and retire from the kingdom—They consent—The king is conducted to Holmby—Discord breaks out between the parliament and the army—Conduct of Cromwell—He causes the king to be taken from Holmby—The army marches upon London, and impeaches eleven presbyterian leaders—They retire from parliament—Stay of the king at Hampton Court—Negotiations of the army with him—Rising in the city in favour of peace—A great many members of both houses retire to the army—They are brought by the army back to London—Defeat of the presbyterians—Republicans and levellers—Cromwell becomes suspected by the soldiers—They mutiny against the officers—Cromwell's able conduct—Alarm of the king—He escapes to the Isle of Wight, p. 302

BOOK THE EIGHTH.

1647—1649.

The rendezvous at Ware—Cromwell suppresses the agitators, and afterwards reconciles himself with them—The parliament sends to the king in four bills the preliminary conditions of peace—The king rejects them, and secretly treats with the Scots—The parliament resolves that it will have no further communications with the king—General discontent and reaction in favour of the king—Embarrassment of Cromwell and the independents—Breaking out of the second civil war—Fairfax's campaign in the east and round London, Cromwell's in the west, Lambert's in the north—Siege of Colchester—The Scots enter England—Cromwell marches against them—Battles of Preston, Wigan, and Warrington—Cromwell in Scotland—The presbyterians regain the ascendancy in London—The parliament again opens a treaty with the king—Negotiations at Newport—Changes in the situation of parties—The army carries off the king from the Isle of Wight—He is removed to Hurst castle—Then to Windsor—Last efforts of the presbyterians in his favour—Trial and death of the king—Monarchy abolished p. 363

APPENDIX of Historical Documents (list of contents prefixed) . . . p. 437

PREFACE

TO THE FIRST EDITION.

I HAVE published the original memoirs of the English revolution; I now publish its history. Previous to the French revolution, this was the greatest event which Europe had to narrate.

I have no fear of its importance being underrated; our revolution, in surpassing, did not make that of England less great in itself; they were both victories in the same war, and to the profit of the same cause; glory is their common attribute; they do not eclipse, but set off each other. My fear is least their true character should be mistaken, least the world should not assign to them that place which is properly theirs in the world's history.

According to an opinion now widely adopted, it would seem as though these two revolutions were unexpected events, which, emanating from principles and conceived in designs unheard of before, threw society out of its ancient and natural course; hurricanes, earthquakes—instances, in a word, of those mysterious phenomena which altogether depart from the ordinary laws of nature, and which burst forth suddenly—blows, as it were, of Providence—it may be to destroy, it may be to renovate. Friends and enemies, panegyrists and detractors, alike adopt this view. According to the one class, they were glorious events, which brought to light, for the first time, truth, liberty, and justice, before the occurrence of

which all was absurdity, iniquity, and tyranny; to which alone the human race owes its terrestrial salvation. According to the other class, they were deplorable calamities, which interrupted a long golden age of wisdom, virtue, and happiness; whose perpetrators proclaimed maxims, put forward pretensions, and committed crimes, till then without parallel: the nations in a paroxysm of madness dashed aside from their accustomed road; an abyss opened beneath their feet.

Thus, whether they exalt or deplore them, whether they bless or curse them, all parties, in considering revolutions, forget all the circumstances, alike isolate them absolutely from the past, alike make them in themselves responsible for the destiny of the world, and load them with anathema or crown them with glory.

It is time to get clear of all such false and puerile declamation.

Far from having interrupted the natural course of events in Europe, neither the English revolution nor our own, ever said, wished, or did anything that had not been said, wished, done, or attempted, a hundred times before they burst forth. They proclaimed the illegality of absolute power; the free consent of the people, in reference to laws and taxes, and the right of armed resistance, were elemental principles of the feudal system; and the church has often repeated these words of St. Isidore, which we find in the canons of the fourth council of Toledo: "He is king who rules his people with justice; if he rule otherwise, he shall no longer be king." They attacked prerogative, and sought to introduce greater equality into social order: kings throughout Europe have done the same; and, down to our own times, the various steps in the progress of civil equality have been founded upon the laws and measured by the progress of royalty. They demanded that public offices should be thrown open to the citizens at large, should be distributed according to merit only, and that power should be conferred

by election: this is the fundamental principle of the internal government of the church, which not only acts upon it, but has emphatically proclaimed its worth. Whether we consider the general doctrines of the two revolutions, or the results to which they were applied—whether we regard the government of the state, or civil legislation, property or persons, liberty or power—nothing will be found of which the invention originated with them, nothing which is not equally met with, or which, at all events, did not come into existence in periods which are called regular.

Nor is this all: those principles, those designs, those efforts which are attributed exclusively to the English revolution and to our own, not only preceded them by several centuries, but are precisely the same principles, the same efforts, to which society in Europe owes all its progress. Was it by its disorders and its privileges, by its brute force, and by keeping men down beneath its yoke, that the feudal aristocracy took part in the development of nations? No: it struggled against royal tyranny, exercised the right of resistance, and maintained the maxims of liberty. For what have nations blessed kings? Was it for their pretensions to divine right, to absolute power? for their profusion? for their courts? No: kings assailed the feudal system and aristocratical privileges; they introduced unity into legislation, and into the executive administration; they aided the progress of equality. And the clergy—whence does it derive its power? how has it promoted civilization? Was it by separating itself from the people, by taking fright at human reason, by sanctioning tyranny in the name of Heaven? No: it gathered together, without distinction, in its churches, and under the law of God, the great and the small, the poor and the rich, the weak and the strong; it honoured and fostered science, instituted schools, favoured the propagation of knowledge, and gave activity to the mind. Interrogate the history of the masters of the world; examine the influence of the various classes which

have decided its destiny; wherever any good shall manifest itself, wherever the lasting gratitude of man shall recognise a great service done to humanity, it will be seen that these were steps towards the object which were pursued by the English revolution and by our own; we shall find ourselves in presence of one of the principles they sought to establish.

Let these mighty events, then, no longer be held forth as monstrous apparitions in the history of Europe; let us hear no more about their unheard-of pretensions, their infernal inventions. They advanced civilization in the path it has been pursuing for fourteen centuries; they professed the maxims, they forwarded the works to which man has, in all time, owed the development of his nature and the amelioration of his condition; they did that which has been by turns the merit and the glory of the clergy, of the aristocracy, and of kings.

I do not think mankind will much longer persist in absolutely condemning them because they are chargeable with errors, calamities, and crimes. Admit all this to the full: nay, exceed the severity of the condemners, and closely examine their accusations to supply their omissions; then summon them, in their turn, to draw up the list of the errors, the crimes, and the calamities, of those times and those powers which they have taken under their protection: I much doubt whether they will accept the challenge.

It may be asked: in what respect, then, are the two revolutions so distinguishable from any other epoch, that carrying on, as they did, the common work of ages, they merited their name, and changed, in effect, the face of the world? The answer is this:—

Various powers have successively predominated in European society, and led by turns the march of civilization. After the fall of the Roman empire and the invasion of the Barbarians, amid the dissolution of all ties, the ruin of all regular

power, dominion everywhere fell into the hands of bold brute force. The conquering aristocracy took possession of, all things, persons and property, people and land. In vain did a few great men, Charlemagne in France, Alfred in England, attempt to subject this chaos to the unity of the monarchical system. All unity was impossible. The feudal hierarchy was the only form that society would accept. It pervaded everything, Church as well as State; bishops and abbots became barons, the king was merely chief lord. Yet, rude and unsettled as was this organization, Europe is indebted to it for its first step out of barbarism. It was among the proprietors of flesh, by their mutual relations, their laws, their customs, their feelings, their ideas, that European civilization began.

They weighed fearfully upon the people. The clergy alone sought to claim, on behalf of the community, a little reason, justice, and humanity. He who held no place in the feudal hierarchy, had no other asylum than the churches, no other protectors than the priests. Inadequate as it was, yet this protection was immense, for there was none beside. Moreover, the priests alone offered some food to the moral nature of man; to that invincible craving after thought, knowledge, hope, and belief, which overcomes all obstacles and survives all misfortune. The church soon acquired a prodigious power in every part of Europe. Nascent royalty added to its strength by borrowing its assistance. The preponderance passed from the conquering aristocracy to the clergy.

By the co-operation of the church and its own inherent vigour, royalty rose up to a stature above that of its rivals; but the clergy which had aided, now wished to enslave it. In this new danger, royalty called to its assistance sometimes the barons, now become less formidable, more frequently the commons, the people, already strong enough to give good help but not strong enough to demand a high price for their

services. By their aid, royalty triumphed in its second struggle, and became in its turn the ruling power, invested with the confidence of nations.

Such is the history of ancient Europe. The feudal aristocracy, the clergy, royalty, by turns possessed it, successively presided over its destiny and its progress. It was to their co-existence and to their struggles that it was, for a long time, indebted for all it achieved of liberty, prosperity, enlightenment; in a word, for the development of its civilization.

In the seventeenth century in England, in the eighteenth in France, all struggle between these three powers had ceased; they lived together in sluggish peace. It may even be said, that they had lost their historical character, and even the remembrance of those efforts, which, of old, constituted their power and their splendour. The aristocracy no longer protected public liberty, nor even its own; royalty no longer laboured to abolish aristocratical privilege; it seemed, on the contrary, to have become favourable to its possessors, in return for their servility. The clergy, a spiritual power, feared the human mind, and no longer able to guide, called upon it, with threats, to check its career. Still civilization followed its course, daily more general and more active. Forsaken by its ancient leaders, astonished at their apathy and at the humour they displayed, and at seeing that less was done for it as its power and its desires grew larger, the people began to think it had better take to transact its own affairs itself; and, assuming in its own person all the functions which its former leaders no longer fulfilled, claimed at once of the crown liberty, of the aristocracy equality, of the clergy the rights of human intellect. Then burst forth revolutions.

These did, for the benefit of a new power, what Europe had in other cases already several times witnessed; they gave to society leaders who would and could direct it in its progress. By this title alone had the aristocracy, the church, and

royalty by turns enjoyed the preponderance. The people now took possession of it by the same means, in the name of the same necessities.

Such was the true operation, the real characteristic of the English revolution as well as of our own. After having considered them as absolutely alike, it has been said that they had nothing but appearances in common. The first, it has been contended, was political rather than social; the second sought to change at once both society and government; the one sought liberty, the other equality; the one, still more religious than political, only substituted dogma for dogma, a church for a church; the other, philosophical more especially, claimed the full independence of reason: an ingenious comparison, and not without its truth, but well nigh as superficial, as frivolous as the opinion it pretends to correct. While, under the external resemblance of the two revolutions, great differences are perceptible, so, beneath their differences, is hidden a resemblance still more profound. The English Revolution, it is true, from the same causes that brought it forth an age before ours, retained a more decided impress of the ancient social state: there, free institutions, which had their origin in the very depth of barbarism, had survived the despotism they could not prevent; the feudal aristocracy, or at least a portion of it, had united its cause to that of the people; royalty, even in the days of its supremacy, had never been fully or undisturbedly absolute; the national church had itself begun religious reform, and called forth the daring inquiries of mind. Everywhere, in the laws, the creed, the manners of the people, revolution found its work half accomplished; and from that order of things which it sought to change, came at once assistance and obstacles, useful allies and still powerful adversaries. It thus presented a singular mixture of elements, to all appearance the most contrary, at once aristocratic and popular, religious and philosophical, appealing alternately to laws and theories; now proclaiming a

new yoke for conscience, now its entire liberty; sometimes narrowly confined within the limits of facts, at others soaring to the most daring attempts; placed, in short, between the old and new social state, rather as a bridge over which to pass from the one to the other, than as an abyss of separation.

The most terrible anity, on the contrary, pervaded the French revolution; the new spirit alone dominated; and the old system, far from taking its part and its place in the movement, only sought to defend itself against it, and only defended itself for a moment; it was alike without power as without virtue. On the day of the explosion, one fact only remained real and powerful, the general civilization of the country. In this great but sole result, old institutions, old manners, creeds, the memory of the past, the whole national life, had fused themselves and become lost. So many active and glorious ages had produced only FRANCE. Hence the immense results of the revolution, and also its immense errors; it possessed absolute power.

Assuredly there is a great difference, and one worthy to be well borne in mind; it strikes us more especially when we regard the two revolutions in themselves as isolated events, detached from general history, and seek to unravel, if I may so express it, their peculiar physiognomy, their individual character. But let them resume their place in the course of ages, and then inquire what they have done towards the development of European civilization, and the resemblance will reappear, will rise above all minor differences. Produced by the same causes, the decay of the feudal aristocracy, the church, and royalty, they both laboured at the same work, the dominion of the public in public affairs; they struggled for liberty against absolute power, for equality against privilege, for progressive and general interests against stationary and individual interests. Their situations were different, their strength unequal; what the one clearly conceived, the other saw but in imperfect outline; in the career which the one fulfilled, the

other soon¹ stopped short; on the same battle-field, the one found victory, the other defeat; the sin of the one was contempt of all religious principle, of the other hypocrisy; one was wiser, the other more powerful; but their means and their success alone differed; their tendency, as well as their origin, was the same; their wishes, their efforts, their progress, were directed towards the same end; what the one attempted or accomplished, the other accomplished or attempted. Though guilty of religious persecution, the English revolution saw the banner of religious liberty uplifted in its ranks; notwithstanding its aristocratic alliances, it founded the preponderance of the commons; though especially intent upon civil order, it still called for more simple legislation, for parliamentary reform, the abolition of entails, and of primogenitureship; and though disappointed in premature hopes, it enabled English society to take a great stride out of the monstrous inequality of the feudal system. In a word, the analogy of the two revolutions is such, that the first would never have been thoroughly understood had not the second taken place.

In our days, the history of the English revolution has changed its face. Hume¹ for a long series of years enjoyed the privilege of forming, in accordance with his views, the opinion of Europe; and, notwithstanding the aid of Mirabeau,² Mrs. Macauley's declamations had not been able to shake his authority. All at once, men's minds have recovered their natural independence; a crowd of works have attested, not only that this epoch has become once more the object of lively sympathy, but that the narrative and opinions of Hume have ceased to satisfy the imagination and reason of the public. A great

¹ The first volume of Hume's History of the House of Stuart appeared in England in 1754, and the second in 1756.

² Mrs. Macauley's work was to have been a 'History of England from the Accession of James the First to the Elevation of the House of Hanover,' but it reaches no further than the fall of James the Second. It was published in England from 1763 to 1783. Of the French translation, sent forth in 1791, under the name of Mirabeau, only two volumes appeared.

orator, Mr. Fox,¹ distinguished writers, Mr. Malcolm Laing,² Macdiarmid,³ Brodie,⁴ Lingard,⁵ Godwin,⁶ &c., hastened to meet this new-roused curiosity. Born in France, the movement could not fail to make its way there; *L'Histoire de Cromwell* by M. Villemain, *L'Histoire de la Revolution de 1688*, by M. Mazure, evidently prove, that neither for us, was Hume sufficient; and I have been able myself, to publish the voluminous collection of the original memoirs of that epoch, without wearying the attention or exhausting the curiosity of readers.⁷

It would little become me to enter here into a detailed examination of these works; but I do not hesitate to assert that, without the French revolution, without the vivid light it threw on the struggle between the Stuarts and the English people, they would not possess the new merits which distinguish them. I need only as a proof, the difference that is to be remarked between those produced by Great Britain, and those which France gave birth to. How great soever the patriotic interest inspired in the mind of the former, by the revolution of 1640, even when they place themselves under the banner of one of the parties which it educated, historical criticism reigns throughout their works; they apply themselves more especially to exact research, to the comparison and cross-questioning of witnesses; what they relate, is to them an old story they thoroughly know, not a drama at which they are present; a period long past, which they pride themselves on being well acquainted with, but in whose

¹ History of the Two Last Kings of the House of Stuart, 4to. London 1806.

² History of Scotland from the Union of the Crowns to the Union of the Kingdom, 4 vols. 8vo. First published, 1800.

³ Lives of British Statesmen, 2 vols. 8vo, second edition, London, 1820. The second volume contains the Lives of Strafford and Clarendon.

⁴ History of the British Empire, from the Accession of Charles the First to the Restoration of Charles the Second, 4 vols. 8vo. Edinburgh, 1822.

⁵ History of England; the 9th and 10th volumes (London, 1825, 8vo), contain the reigns of James I. and Charles I.

⁶ History of the Commonwealth of England; London, 1824; 4 vols. 8vo.

⁷ This Collection, now completed, forms 25 vols. 8vo. Paris, Didier.

bosom they live not. Mr. Brodie fully participates in all the prejudices, distrust, and anger of the bitterest puritans against Charles and the cavaliers; while, to the faults, the crimes of his party, he is wholly blind. But, at least, one would imagine so much passion would produce an animated narrative; that the party exciting so much sympathy in the mind of the writer, would be described with truth and power. Not so: despite the ardour of his predilections, Mr. Brodie studies, but sees not, discusses, but describes not; he admires the popular party, but does not produce it strikingly on the stage; his work is a learned and useful dissertation, not a moral and animated history. Mr. Lingard shares in none of the opinions, none of the affections of Mr. Brodie; he remains impartial between the king and the parliament; he pleads the cause of neither, and makes no attempt to refute the errors of his predecessors; he even boasts of not having opened the work of Hume since he undertook his own; he wrote, he says, with the aid of original documents alone, with the times he wished to describe ever before his eyes, and with the firm resolution of shunning all systematic theory. Does he restore life to history by this impartiality? Not at all: Mr. Lingard's impartiality is, in this case, sheer indifference; a Roman-catholic priest, it matters little to him whether Church of England men or presbyterians triumph; thus, indifference has helped him no better than passion did Mr. Brodie to penetrate beyond the external, and, so to speak, the material form of events; with him, too, the principal merit is in having carefully examined facts, and collected and disposed them in commendable order. Mr. Malcolm Laing had discerned with more sagacity the political character of the revolution; he shows very well that from the first, without distinctly apprehending its own aim, it sought to displace power, to transfer it to the house of commons, and thus to substitute parliamentary for royal government, and that it could only rest on this basis. But

the moral side of the epoch, the religious enthusiasm, the popular passions, the party intrigues, the personal rivalries, all those scenes in which human nature displays itself, when freed from the restraint of old habits and laws, are wanting in his book; it is the report of a clear-sighted judge, but of one who has only resorted to written documents, and has called before him in person neither actors nor witnesses. I might pass in review all the works with which England has been recently enriched on this subject; they would all, on examination, be found to present the same character—a marked revival of interest in this great crisis of the national life, a more attentive study of the facts that relate to it, a keener feeling of its merits, a juster appreciation of its causes and consequences; still it is but meditation and learning applied to the production of works of erudition or philosophy. I seek in vain for that natural sympathy in the writer for his subject that gives to history light and life; and if Hampden or Clarendon were to return to life, I can scarcely believe they would recognise their own times.

I open the *Histoire de Cromwell* by M. Villemain, and find altogether another scene before me. It is less complete, less learned, less exact than several of the works I have adverted to; but, throughout, there is a quick and keen comprehension of the opinions, the passions, the vicissitudes of revolutions, of public tendencies, and individual character, of the unconquerable nature and the so changing forms of parties; the historian's reason teaches him how to appreciate all situations, all ideas; his imagination is moved by all real and deep impressions; his impartiality, somewhat too sceptical if anything, is yet more animated than is frequently even the passion of the exclusive advocates of a cause; and though the revolution only appears in his book confined within the too narrow frame of a biography, it is clearer and more animated than I have met with it elsewhere.

The reason of this is, that, setting aside the advantages of

talent, M. Villemain had those of situation. He has viewed and judged the English revolution from the midst of that of France; he found in the men and the events developing themselves beneath his own eyes, the key to those he had to paint; he drew life from his own times and infused it into the times he wished to recal.

I have no desire to carry these reflections further; I have ventured so much only to point out how great is the analogy between the two epochs, and also to explain how a Frenchman may believe that the history of the English revolution has not yet been written in a fully satisfactory manner, and that he may be allowed to attempt it. I have carefully studied nearly all the old and modern works of which it has formed the subject; I did not fear that this study would weaken the sincerity of my own impressions or the independence of my judgment; it seems to me there is too much timidity in dreading so readily least an auxiliary should become a master; too much pride in refusing so absolutely all aid. Yet, and if I do not deceive myself it will easily be recognised, original documents have more peculiarly been my guides. I have nothing to observe here, as to the "Memoirs;" I endeavoured in the "Notices" I prefixed to my edition of them, clearly to explain their character and worth; those which did not find a place in my "Collection," though I have made use of them in my "History," appear to me of too little importance to require remark. As for the collections of official acts and documents, they are very numerous; and, though often explored, still abound in unworked treasures. I have had constantly before me those of Rushworth, Thurloe, the journals of both houses of parliament, the "Parliamentary History," the old one as well as that of Mr. Cobbett, the "Collection of State Trials," and a great number of other works of the same kind, which it would be uninteresting to enumerate. I also found in the pamphlets of the time, not only English, but French, some curious information; for the

French public was more occupied than is imagined with the English revolution; many pamphlets were published in France for and against it, and the Frondeurs more than once put forward its example, against Mazarin and the court. I must also say, to do justice to a man and a work now too much neglected, that I have often consulted with profit the History of England, by Rapin de Thoyras; and that notwithstanding the inferiority of the writer's talents, the English revolution is perhaps better understood in it, and more completely displayed than in the works of most of its successors.

In conclusion, let me be allowed to express here my gratitude to all those persons who in France and in England, have been good enough to sanction my work in its progress, and to promote it by the most valuable assistance. Amongst others, I owe to the kindness of sir James Mackintosh, as inexhaustible as his mind and knowledge, suggestions and advice which no one but himself could have given me; and one of those, who, amongst ourselves, are the most versed in the past history as well as in the present state of England, M. Gallois, has thrown open to me, with a kindness I have some right to consider friendship, the treasures of his library and of his conversation.

F. G.

PARIS, *April*, 1828.

ADVERTISEMENT

TO THE EDITION OF 1841.

THE History of the Revolution of England comprises three grand periods. In the first, under Charles I. (1625—1649), the Revolution was preparing, was put forth, and took its stand. In the second, under the Long Parliament and Cromwell (1649—1660), it essayed to found its own form of government, which it called a Republic, and fell in the attempt. The third period is that of monarchical re-action, successful for a while, under Charles II., who, in his cautious selfishness, aimed at nothing beyond his own personal enjoyment, but ruined by the blind passion of James II., who aimed at absolute power. In 1688, England achieved the point she aimed at in 1640, and quitted the career of revolution for that of liberty.

I publish, without alteration, a new edition of my History of the first period. I have collected, for that of the two other periods, a body of materials which, as I believe, are neither without importance or variety. A day will doubtless come, when I shall be able to make use of these materials: meantime, wanting the leisure to complete my narrative of this stupendous event, I apply my mind at every available moment, to its just comprehension.

F. G.

INTRODUCTORY DISCOURSE

OF THE

HISTORY OF THE REVOLUTION OF ENGLAND.

THE Revolution of England succeeded. It succeeded twice. Its authors founded in England constitutional monarchy; its descendants founded in America the Republic of the United States. There is no longer any obscurity about these great events: time, which has sanctioned, has illumined them. Sixty years ago France entered upon, the other day Europe precipitated itself upon, the paths which England had opened. I seek to show the causes which have given, in England to constitutional monarchy, in English America to the republic, the solid success which France and Europe have hitherto been pursuing in vain, amid those mysterious experiments in revolution, which, as they are well or ill sustained, make nations great, or send them astray for ages.

It was in the name of Faith, and of religious liberty, that, in the 16th century, commenced the movement which, from that epoch, suspended at times, but ever renewed, has been agitating and exciting the world. The tempest rose first in the human soul: it struck the Church before it reached the State.

It has been said that Protestantism was, at bottom, a political, rather than a religious revolution: an insurrection, in the name of worldly interests, against the established Church, rather than the bounding impulse of a faith, in the name of the eternal interests of man. To say this, is to judge superficially, and altogether from appearances, and it is an error which has involved, in courses fatal to themselves, the powers, spiritual

or temporal, that have been misled by it. Absorbed in the suppression of the revolutionary element of Protestantism, they have taken no heed to its religious element. The spirit of revolt is, doubtless, very powerful: but it is not powerful enough to accomplish of itself such results. It was not merely to shake off a yoke, it was also to profess and to practise a faith, that the Reformation of the 16th century burst forth and continued onward. After the lapse of three centuries, a sovereign, incontestable fact, demonstrates this most emphatically. Two Protestant countries, the most protestant of Europe, England and Holland, are at this moment the two countries in which the Christian faith preserves most life and most empire. It would manifest strange ignorance of man's nature, to imagine that the religious fervour would have thus sustained and perpetuated itself, after the triumph of the insurrection, had the movement been, in its outset and in its fundamental principle, other than essentially religious.

In Germany, in the 16th century, the revolution was religious, and not political; in France, in the 18th, it was political, and not religious. It was, in the 17th century, the fortune of England, that the spirit of religious faith and the spirit of political liberty reigned together in her heart, and that she undertook, at one and the same time, both revolutions. All the high passions of human nature were thus set in array, without her wholly breaking bounds; and the hopes and ambitions of eternity remained to men, after they believed that their ambitions and their hopes of this world had failed.

The English reformers, the political reformers more especially, did not consider that there was any need of a revolution. The laws, the traditions, the examples, the whole past of their country was dear and sacred to them; and therein they found alike the fulcrum for their pretensions and the sanction of their ideas. It was in the name of the Great Charter, and of the many statutes which, in the course of four centuries, had confirmed it, that they claimed their liberties. During four centuries, not a generation had passed upon the English soil without pronouncing the name, without seeing the face of parliament. The great barons and the commons, the country gentlemen and the burgesses, met together in 1640, not to quarrel about new acquisitions, but to re-enter upon their common inheritance; they met to resume ancient positive rights, and not

to pursue the experimental combinations, infinite yet unknown, of human thought.

The religious reformers did not enter the Long Parliament of Charles I. with equally legitimate pretensions. The Episcopal Church of England, as it had been constituted, first by the capricious and cruel despotism of Henry VIII., and then by the ably designed and systematic despotism of Elizabeth, did not suit them. It was, in their eyes, an incomplete, incongruous reformation—incessantly compromised by the danger of a return to the catholic church, from which it had never far enough removed—and they meditated, for the christian Church of their country, an entirely new remodelling, and a new constitution. The revolutionary spirit was with them more ardent and more avowed, than with the party that more especially occupied itself with political reforms. Not that the religious innovators themselves were wholly given up to theoretic fantasies: they had an anchor to which they held fast, a compass in which they had full faith. The Gospel was their Great Charter; subjected, it is true, to their interpretations and their commentaries, but anterior and superior to their will; they respected it sincerely, and humbled themselves, despite their pride, before that law, which they themselves had not made.

To these guarantees of moderation, which, in the disposition of their own partisans, the two revolutions now commencing, possessed, Providence added a further favour. They were not, in their outset, condemned to that wrong, which soon becomes a danger, the spontaneously assailing, without clear and pressing necessity, a mild and inoffensive power. In the seventeenth century, in England, royal power was the aggressor. Charles I. full of haughty pretensions, without high ambition, and rather that he might not sink in the estimation of the kings, his equals, than from any desire to oppress his people, twice essayed to give authority to the maxims and practice of absolute monarchy; first, in presence of the parliament, and himself governed by a vain and frivolous favourite¹ whose presumptuous incompetence shocked the good sense and wounded the honour of the obscurest citizens; then, by dispensing with any parliament at all, and governing alone, by a minister, energetic, able, ambitious and imperious with grandeur; devoted to a king who neither understood nor sustained him, and learning,

¹ George Villiers, Duke of Buckingham.

too late that, to save kings, it is not enough nobly to sacrifice oneself in serving them.¹

Against this aggressive despotism, enterprising rather than powerful, and which alike attacked, in State and Church, the ancient rights and the new liberties demanded by the country, the country had no thought of going beyond legal resistance, and placed its reliance in the parliament. There, resistance was as unanimous as it was legitimate. Men the most various in origin and in character, nobles, gentry, and burgesses, courtiers, and men wholly strange to the court, friends and enemies of the Established Church, all rose with one accord against such infinite and great grievances and abuses; and the abuses fell, the grievances disappeared, as the decrepit walls of an abandoned fort crumble beneath the first blows of the assailants.

In this explosion of national indignation and of national hopes, some minds more clear-sighted, some consciences more scrupulous than others, already felt uneasiness. Vengeance not merely disfigures, but wholly distorts and alters justice; and passion, haughty in its right, goes further than it has the title or even the intention to go. Strafford was justly accused, unjustly judged. The politicians, who did not seek the destruction of the episcopal church, suffered the bishops to be outraged and humiliated, as men fallen never to rise again. The ill-regulated blows that struck from the crown its usurpations and its illegal pretensions, wounded it at the same time in its just prerogatives. Incidents of grave import revealed, courageous voices denounced, the spirit of revolution hidden beneath the demand for reform. Warnings, rays of light cast upon their future progress, have never been withheld from rising revolutions; but the necessity to triumph, and its glory, overpowered the conviction of faults and the presentiment of their dangers.

When the work of reform was accomplished—when the grievances which had aroused the unanimous reprobation of the country were redressed—when the powers, authors of those grievances, and the men, their instruments, were prostrated, the scene changed—a new question arose: How was that which had been acquired to be retained? How make sure that England should thenceforth be governed upon the

¹ Thomas Wentworth, Earl of Strafford.

principles and by the laws she had reestablished? The political reformers began to feel themselves perplexed. Above them was the king, who was conspiring against them, while he seemed yielding to them. If the king resumed in the government, the power which the reforms accomplished still left him, he would make use of it against the reforms and the reformers. Around them were their allies, the religious innovators, presbyterians and various sectaries, for whom political reform was not sufficient, and who, in their hatred of the Established Church, aspired not only to shake off its yoke, but to destroy it, and to impose their own upon it. For the security of their work, for their own security, the chiefs resolved to remain under arms. Even had they wished to lay aside their weapons, their soldiers would not have permitted it.

One means alone could, in their eyes, confirm their security: this was, that parliament should retain the sovereign power it had assumed; and that it should be rendered permanently impossible for the king to govern against the opinion of parliament, and of the House of Commons in parliament.

This is the result which, in England, constitutional monarchy has attained—this is the aim which, two centuries ago, its partisans pursued. But in the 17th century they had neither the enlightenment nor the political virtues which this government requires.

There is in the heart of man so much arrogance and so much weakness combined, that he aspires, at one and the same time, to all the glory, and to all the repose that may be hoped from success. He thinks it little to surmount obstacles; he must suppress them, that he may relieve his mind wholly from their thought; and triumph itself does not content him, unless he can enjoy it in all the insolence of complete security. Constitutional monarchy does not satisfy these evil tendencies of human nature. To none of the powers which it sets in array, does it accord the pleasures of undivided and wholly secure domination. It imposes upon them all, even upon the most preponderant, the continuous labour of obligatory alliances, of mutual circumspection, of constant arrangements and rearrangements, of indirect influences, and of a struggle incessantly renewed, with the chances, incessantly renewing, of success and failure. It is on these terms that constitutional monarchy definitively assures triumph to the interests and

feelings of the country, itself subject to moderation in its desires, and to vigilance and patience in its efforts.

Neither the crown nor the parliament of England understood in the 17th century these conditions of their mutual government; they refused, accordingly, to undergo them. Royalty claimed to remain, the House of Commons claimed to become, directly and infallibly sovereign. Their pride required this satisfaction, their fears this guarantee.

To attain this object, to keep and to exercise the sovereign empire they had grasped, the House of Commons could no longer be content with the reform of abuses, and with the re-establishment of legal rights. They felt it necessary radically to alter the old laws, to get all power into their own hands.

When things had reached this point, there was a great break up amongst the reformers. The more far-sighted, or the more timid, embraced the defence of legal order and of menaced monarchy; the rest, more daring, or less scrupulous, entered upon the path of revolution.

At this period took birth the two great parties, which, gradually developing themselves under various names and various aspects, have since for two centuries presided over the destinies of England: the party devoted to the maintenance of established order, and the party favourable to the progress of popular influences; the Tories and the Whigs, the conservatives and the innovators.

The struggle in parliament was fierce, but brief. The monarchical party sought to organize itself around the king, and to govern in his name. These first essays of constitutional rule failed ere they had scarce begun; failed by the faults of the king, inconsistent, mutable, obstinate in frivolities, and as insincere with his counsellors as with his enemies; by the inexperience of his counsellors, themselves in turns too exclusive and too feeble, and incessantly tricked and betrayed alike in the palace and in the parliament; by the distrust and pretensions of the revolutionary party, resolved not to be content until the absolute power it sought to destroy had passed under its hands.

One day, in relation to a fresh remonstrance to be presented to the king against old grievances, as though they had not been redressed, the question of majority was clearly and

distinctly put to the two parties. The debate became so violent, that even in the House of Commons itself the members were on the point of coming to blows. A majority of eleven gave the victory to the revolutionary party.

Fifty days after this vote, the king quitted as a fugitive the palace of Whitehall, which he was only to re-enter on his way to the scaffold. The House of Commons immediately ordered that the menaced kingdom should be placed in a state of defence. The parliamentary struggle ceased, the civil war began.

At this solemn moment, patriotic sorrow, dark forebodings were given utterance to, here and there, in both parties, more especially in the party of the king, less confident in its strength, and also, perhaps, in its cause. But such was not the general feeling. Passion, and the hope of success, held power in most hearts. The spirit of resistance to illegality and oppression has been one of the noblest and most salutary characteristics of the English people, throughout the whole course of their history. Docile, and even favourable, to authority, when it acts in virtue of the law, they boldly maintain against it what they deem the law of the land, and their right. Amid all their dissensions, this sentiment alike animated both parties. The revolutionary party struggled against the illegalities and oppressions which England had undergone at the hands of the king in past times, and which they apprehended at his hands in the future. The monarchical party struggled against the illegalities and oppressions which, at the present time, the parliament was inflicting upon the country. The respect for right and for law, though forgotten and violated every hour, still occupied the recesses of men's hearts, and veiled from them the wrongs and the ills that civil war was preparing for them.

The manners of neither party were antagonistic to civil war. The Cavaliers were rough, hot-headed men, still full of those habits of fighting, of that impetuous tendency to violence, which characterised the feudal ages. The Puritans were hard, acerb, stubborn, nurtured in the passions, as in the traditions of the Hebrew people, who defended and avenged their God in smiting their enemies: with both the sacrifice of life was familiar, and the sight of blood no matter of horror. Another cause, less potent, provoked and aggravated the

explosion. Political and religious parties were not alone in the field. Beneath their struggle, lay a social question, the struggle of the various classes for influence and power. Not that these classes were in England radically segregate, and hostile one to the other, as they have been elsewhere. The great barons had asserted and maintained the people's liberties with their own, and the people did not forget this. The country gentlemen and the burgesses had for three centuries sat together in parliament, in the name of the Commons of England. But, in the last hundred years, great changes had taken place in the relative strength of the various classes in the bosom of society, without any analogous changes having been wrought in the government. Commercial activity and religious order had, in the middle classes, given a prodigious impulse to wealth and to thought. In one of the first parliaments in the reign of Charles I. it was remarked, with extreme surprise, that the House of Commons was three times richer than the House of Lords. The high aristocracy no longer possessed, and no longer communicated to the royalty it continued to encircle, the same preponderance in the nation. The burgesses, the minor country gentlemen, the farmers, and the small landed proprietors, at that time a very numerous body, did not exercise over public affairs an influence proportionate with their importance in the country. Their elevation had not kept pace with their growth. Hence had arisen amongst them and the ranks beneath them a proud and powerful spirit of ambition, eager to seize the first occasion to burst forth. Civil war opened a wide field to their energy and to their hopes. It presented, at its outset, no aspect of a social classification, exclusive and hostile: many country gentlemen, several even of the greatest of the great lords, were at the head of the popular party. Soon, the nobility on the one hand, and the middle class and the people on the other, ranged themselves in two masses, the one around the crown, the other around the parliament, and sure symptoms already revealed a great social movement in the heart of a great political struggle, and the effervescence of an ascendant democracy, clearing for itself a way through the ranks of a weakened and divided aristocracy.

Both parties found in the state of society, nay, in the very laws of the land, natural, and almost regular, means of sus-

taining by arms their rights or their pretensions. From the reign of Elizabeth, the House of Commons had applied itself with ardour to the abolition of the remaining institutions, already tottering, of the feudal system. But deep traces of that system still subsisted, and its habits, its sentiments, in some instances its rules, still presided over the relations of the possessors of fiefs, both with the king, their suzerain, and with the portion of the population grouped around them in their castles or upon their estates. These assembled at their voice, whether for festivals or for fighting, as they themselves obeyed the summons of the king, when he claimed their services. It was one of those epochs of transition, when ancient laws, honoured in their obsolescence, still decide the actions of men, whom they no longer formally bind. Devotion had taken the place of servitude; the fidelity of the vassal became the loyalty of the subject; and the cavaliers, rich or poor, flocked round the king, ready to fight and to die for him, followed by a troop, or, as the case might be, a handful of retainers, ready to fight and to die for them.

On their part, the burgesses, the artisans, the people of the towns, had also, under other forms, their means of independent action, and even of war. Organized in municipal or commercial corporations, they met freely to discuss their affairs; they levied taxes, raised militia, administered justice and police, deliberated, in a word, and acted, within the circuit of their walls and the limits, however obscure, of their charters, like so many petty sovereigns. And the extension of commerce and of industry, their wealth, their connexions, their credit, gave to these corporations a power which they applied to the service of their cause, with all the impulsive daring of a youthful and inexperienced pride.

Neither in country nor in town did royalty exercise the empire of a central and sole administration. The financial, military, even the judicial affairs of the country, were, more or less completely, in the hands of local, and well nigh independent authorities: here, of the landed proprietors of the country; there, of the municipal bodies, or of the corporations, who appropriated more and more thoroughly their administrative authority to the promotion of their political cause—now to aid the central power, king; or parliament—now to resist it. And, where these means did not suffice—where it was

necessary for the action to extend itself beyond the sphere of the old and recognised local powers—the spirit of association, traditional and potent in England, speedily established between the counties, the towns, the divisions of the kingdom, and the various classes of society, practical, efficacious combinations, in virtue of which new associations, freely springing up wherever and whenever required, levied taxes, raised troops, formed committees, and selected chiefs, deputed to furnish and direct their share of action in the general cause they embraced.

It was in an association of this character, that of the five Eastern counties united for the support of the parliament, that Cromwell gave the first indications of his strength, and sowed the first seeds of his power.

In a society thus organized and disposed, civil war seemed nothing impracticable. It soon covered the whole face of the country; here, by order of the royal or parliament agents; there, the spontaneous work of the people; and it was maintained by both parties with an energy, mournfully in many cases, but in all unhesitatingly displayed as the exercise of a right and the accomplishment of a duty. Each party had a profound conviction of the justice and of the greatness of its cause. Each, to serve its cause, made those efforts and those sacrifices which elevate the soul even in the very act and moment of leading it astray, and which give to passion the aspect, and sometimes the merit, of virtue. Virtue itself was wanting to neither party. Violent and licentious, the cavaliers had yet in their ranks the finest models of the generous, grand, high-souled old families, full of disinterested devotion, of dignity in submission. The puritans, hard and haughty, rendered to their country a service beyond all price: they established in it austerity of private life and sanctity of domestic manners. The two parties fought with fierce animosity, but still without laying aside, amidst the struggle, all the sentiments of the times of order and of peace. There were no sanguinary outbreaks, no judicial massacres. It was civil war, earnest, fierce, determined, full of violence and of evil, but without barbarian excesses, and kept, by the general manners of the population, within certain limits of right and of humanity.

I the earlier pay this tribute, because the virtues of parties are frail and short-lived, when they have to undergo the blast, and to struggle against the storms of revolutions. From day

to day, with the prolongation of the civil war, respect for right, and just, generous sentiments grew feeble. The natural consequences of the revolutionary state developed themselves, distorting more and more, in both parties, the ideas and habits of law and of morality. The king wanted money: the cavaliers gave way to unbridled pillage. The taxes levied by the parliament did not meet the exigencies of the war: it established in every county a system of confiscation, more or less undisguised, which, under the pretext of *delinquency*, placed in its hands the rents, and in many cases the estates, of its enemies, a daily source of wealth for its partizans. In this general and continuous disorder, amidst the abuses of force and the excesses of desperate misfortune, the evil passions were incessantly called forth; chances of gratification presented themselves to every evil desire; hatred and vengeance took possession of more energetic souls; the feeblar sank into base fear and prostrate servility. The parliament, which pretended to act in the name of the laws, and to serve the king it combated, was condemned, even in its most violent acts, to a false and hypocritical language. Among the royalists, many, distrusting the by-views of the king, called upon for sacrifices wholly beyond their means, and daily more and more dubious of the success of their cause, felt devotion fading away in their hearts, and submitted in despair, or indemnified themselves for their losses by licence and rapine. Falsehood, violence, grasping avarice, mean pusillanimity, egotism in every form, made rapid strides among all who were actually engaged in the strife; while the population, which took no part in it, or but a remotely indirect part, itself undergoing, after a while, the detestable influence of the revolutionary spectacle, lost, little by little, or retained in but dim, flickering memory, its pristine notions of right and of duty, of justice and of virtue.

It was assailed at the same time, and suffered most cruelly in its material interests. War everywhere present and everywhere unrestrained, ravaged town and country, and destroyed the subsistence, the hopes, and the industry of the people. The financial measures of the parliament, worked by local hostilities or intrigues, involved landed property in universal confusion and depreciation. There was no longer security for present means or for the expectations from future labour. Civil life was assailed and unhinged, even in the bosom of

families perfectly unconnected with the political struggle. And as the fear of evil ever spreads further and more rapidly than the evil itself, the country, in its grievous distress, was the prey of an anxiety still more general and more grievous even than its distress. The outburst of its complaints and of its wishes was not long delayed. War was still at its height when, already the cry of *Peace! peace!* resounded at the doors of parliament. Repeated petitions demanded peace, brought by large assemblages, so large and so excited that it was necessary to employ force to disperse them. In the House of Commons itself, notwithstanding the almost universal withdrawal of the first royalist party, a new royalist party was formed, in the name of peace, eager to seize every occasion to proclaim its necessity, and to open negotiations with the king. Essayed, over and over again, all such negotiations failed, by the machinations of those who, in either camp, refused peace, not choosing to make the concessions it necessitated, by the incapacity or weakness of those, who, willing peace, dared not will its conditions. Civil war continued; but the party which had brought it about was broken up; the struggle had re-commenced in parliament, for and against the revolution.

Out of doors, more especially in the country, the people did not content themselves with asking the parliament for peace; they endeavoured themselves, locally at least, to impose it on both parties. Associations were formed, armed bodies set themselves on foot, declaring that they would no longer suffer their lands to be devastated either by parliamentarians or by royalists, and attacked both alike, whenever they encountered them. A sort of armed neutrality in the bosom of civil war: an attempt futile in itself, but serving to manifest how deeply the two parties who insisted upon war, already wounded the feelings and interests of the country. So long as the war was strongly in movement, and the issue doubtful, these sufferings and these convictions of the people, though leading them to a pacific reaction, directed their attention but hesitatingly and glancingly towards the king. They accused him as obstinate and false. They bitterly denounced his secret machinations with the queen and the catholics, whom they passionately hated and feared. They held him responsible for the calamities and for the prolongation of the civil war, at least equally with the parliament.

When the war was at an end, and the king a prisoner in the hands of the parliament, the pacific reaction became more decidedly and more generally royalist. The king could do nothing, and bore his misfortunes nobly. The parliament could do everything, yet put no stop to the calamities of the country. Upon the parliament, therefore, now weighed the whole responsibility: against parliament were directed all the ebullitions and discontent of disappointed hopes, of suspicions, of anger and malediction for the present, of terrors for the future. Impelled by this national sentiment, enlightened by the imminent danger, the political reformers, the first chiefs of the revolution in parliament, and with them a portion of the religious innovators, the Presbyterians, enemies of the Episcopal Church, but not of the monarchy, essayed a last effort to effect peace with the king, and to terminate, at one stroke, the war and the revolution.

They were sincere, nay, passionately earnest in their desire, but still full of those revolutionary prejudices and pretensions which had already, on several occasions, rendered peace impossible. By the conditions which they sought to impose upon the king, they required him to sanction their destruction of the monarchy and of the church; or, in other words, to complete with his own hands, as he re-entered it, the downfall of the edifice which constituted his security, and to which he had vowed his faith.

They had proclaimed as a principle, and put in practice, the direct sovereignty of the House of Commons; and, constrained in their turn to resist the popular current, they were astonished no longer to receive the aid, nay, to encounter the distrust and hostility, of that aristocracy and of that church which they had decried and demolished.

Even had they succeeded in concluding peace with the king, peace would have been vain. It was too late to arrest revolution, too soon to guide it to its true and national goal. God was only then beginning to exercise his justice, and to administer his lessons. The instant that the first chiefs of the movement sought to reconstruct the ruins they had made, the real revolutionary party rose, and, treating their new-grown wisdom with brutal contempt, drove them from parliament, condemned the king to death, and proclaimed the republic.

Two centuries have past away since the republic of England

caused the head of Charles I. to fall, itself falling almost immediately afterwards upon the soil stained with that blood. The French republic has since presented over again to the world the same spectacle. And yet we still hear it said that these great crimes were acts of high policy, commanded by the necessity of founding those republics which have scarce survived them a few days!

It is the pretension of insane folly, and of human perversity, to cover itself with the veil of grandeur; neither the truth of history nor the interest of nations can endure the lie.

The spirit of faith and of religious liberty had degenerated, with some sects, into a fanaticism, arrogant, quarrelsome, intractable to all authority, and which found its sole gratification in the wild invectives of dogmatic independence and of inflated pride. By the civil war these sectaries had been made soldiers, at once casuists and devotees, enthusiasts and disciplinarians. Emanating, most of them, from the popular classes and avocations, they revelled in the delight of commanding, of dominating, of thinking and calling themselves the chosen and mighty instruments of the will and of the justice of God. Favoured partly by religious enthusiasm, partly by military discipline, partly by the democratic spirit, Cromwell had gained the confidence of these men, and made himself their chief. His youth, spent amid the erratic excitements of a wild, fiery temperament, amid the impulses of an ardent and restless pietism, or in the service of the interests or desires of the population around him, when high politics and war opened before him, he rushed into the new path with passionate earnestness, as that path in which alone he could develop his powers, and satisfy his ambition: the most wildly vehement of sectaries—the most energetic of revolutionists—the most able of soldiers—equally ready, eager, to harangue, to pray, to conspire, to battle; his oratory characterised by an expansive, winning ease, full of power; lying at need, with an inexhaustible and unhesitating hardihood, which struck even his enemies with surprise and embarrassment; at once lofty, impassioned, and coarse, reckless and rational, mystic and practical; the perspective of his imagination without limits, the necessities of his action impeded by no scruple; resolute to succeed at whatever price; more prompt than any man to

discern and to grasp the means of success; and impressing upon all, friends or foes, the conviction that none would triumph so fully and go so far as he.

To such a party, led by such a man, a republic was exactly suitable. It provided the satisfaction of their passions, an opening for all their hopes, a security for the interests which they had carved out of the civil war. It delivered over the country to the army, by the genius of its chief, and empire to Cromwell, by the discipline and complicity of his soldiers.

From respect for their sincerity, their genius, their misfortunes, I will not express the whole of my judgment of certain men, whose names have become celebrated, republicans also, from a political theory, constructed upon the models of antiquity, rather than from religious fanaticism,—Sidney, Vane, Ludlow, Harrington, Hutchinson, Milton; high minds, great souls, nobly ambitious for their country and for humanity; but of such weak judgment and of such insane pride, that neither fortune nor misfortune taught them a lesson; credulous as children, obstinate as old men, ever blinded by their hopes to their faults and to their dangers; and who at the moment when, by their own anarchical tyranny, they were preparing the way for a tyranny more rational and more powerful, thought they were founding the freest and most glorious of governments.

Out of these sects, organized in regiments, of these coteries setting up for a parliament, no person in England desired a republic. A republic was wholly offensive to the traditions, the manners, the laws, the old affections, the old venerations, the regular interests, the order, the good sense, and the moral sense of the country.

Incensed and uneasy at this manifest aversion of the public for their designs, the sectaries and Cromwell deemed that, to found a rule so generally odious, it was essential, at the very outset, by a terrible and irremediable blow, to prove its power and to affirm its right. They agreed to crown the republic upon the scaffold of Charles I.

But revolutionists, even the ablest of them, are short-sighted. Intoxicated by the passion, or dominated by the necessity of the moment, they do not foresee that what to-day constitutes their triumph, will be to-morrow their condemnation. The execution of Charles I. handed over England, stupor-struck,

to the republicans and to Cromwell. But the republic and Cromwell, mortally wounded by the same blow, were, from that day forth, but a violent and ephemeral regime, branded with that seal of supreme iniquity which devotes to certain ruin, powers the most powerful and the most illustrious.

The judges of Charles I. tried by every conceivable means to divest their work of this fatal attribute, and to present it to the world as the justice of God, which it had been their mission to accomplish. Charles had aimed at absolute power, and had waged civil war. Many rights had been violated, much blood had been spilt by his orders or with his sanction. They cast upon him the whole responsibility of the late tyranny, and of the war: they demanded at his hands the reckoning for all the liberties which had been oppressed, for all the blood which had been spilt: his was a crime without specification, which his death alone could expiate. But the conscience of a people is not to be thus mystified and blinded, even when it is half-paralysed with anxiety and perturbation. Others, besides the king, had oppressed the country, and imbrued it in blood. If the king had violated the rights of his subjects, the rights or royalty, also ancient, also written in the laws, had been equally violated, attacked, usurped. The king had waged war, but it was in self-defence. Who was there that did not know that at the very juncture when he made up his mind to war, war was resolved upon against him, for the purpose of constraining him, after so many concessions, to yield up what still remained to him of rights and of power, the last wreck of the legal government of the country? And now that the king was vanquished, he was judged, he was condemned, without law, against all law, for acts which no law had foreseen or categorised as crimes; which the conscience neither of the king nor of the people had ever imagined to consider as falling under the jurisdiction of men, or punishable at their hands. What utter indignation, what a revolt of the universal mind of the country would have burst forth, had the obscurest of its citizens been thus treated, been put to death for crimes defined *post facto*, by self-appointed judges, yesterday his enemies, to-day his competitors, to-morrow his heirs! yet that which none would have dared essay against the least of the people of England, had been done against the King of England; against the supreme head of the Church and of the State; against the representative and the

symbol of authority, of order, of law, of justice—of all that, in the society of man, touches upon the limits and awakens the idea of the attributes of God!

There is no fanaticism so blind, no policy so perverse, which, in the very moment of its triumph, has not been startled by the apparition at its side, within its very ranks, of some dazzling effulgence, the solemn and unexpected protest of the human conscience. Two republicans, one of them placed in the list of the king's judges, the names the most glorious of the party, Vane and Sidney, whether from scruple or from prudence, would not sit on the trial, and quitted London, in order that they might not even witness it. And when, sovereign mistress, the House of Commons nominated the republican council of state, of forty-one members, summoned to constitute it, twenty-two absolutely refused to take the oath, which set forth an approval of the king's condemnation; and the regicide republicans, with Cromwell at their head, were fain to accept for their colleagues men who refused upon any terms to pass for their accomplices.

The new government encountered at first only passive resistance; but this it encountered everywhere.

Of the twelve judges, six absolutely refused to continue their functions; and the other six only consented, on the condition that they should still administer justice according to the ancient laws of the land. The republican parliament accepted their condition.

The parliament had ordered that the republic should be proclaimed in the city of London. The lord mayor refused to proclaim it. He was removed from his office, and sent to prison. Notwithstanding the immediate presence of the new lord mayor, three months elapsed before the proclamation was ventured upon; and when it at length took place, many of the aldermen absented themselves. The ceremony was protected by troops, but they could not wholly repress the ebullitions of popular scorn and hate. The common council was re-organized; many of the members nominated refused to accept the office. It became necessary to authorize the council to act with a materially diminished number. It was even at one time a question whether it would not be expedient to abolish the franchises of the city altogether.

When the republican coinage had to be struck, the Master of

the Mint declared that he would have nothing to do with it, and resigned his office.

An oath of fidelity to the republic, drawn up in terms the most simple and inoffensive that could be devised, was required from the civil functionaries and from the beneficed clergymen. Thousands gave up their places and their livings, rather than take it. More than a year after the establishment of the republic, the convocation of the Presbyterian clergy, assembled in London, formally declared that the oath ought not to be taken. It was sought to be imposed upon the Universities of Oxford and Cambridge: the most eminent members of those corporations, professors and heads of colleges, resigned their posts.

The order was issued, throughout England, to destroy the insignia of royalty upon all the public edifices and monuments. The order was executed in scarcely a single instance. It was several times renewed with as little success; and the republic, after it had been established more than two years, found itself constrained once more to renew the order, throwing the responsibility and the cost of performance upon the parishes.

Lastly, it was not until two years after the condemnation of the king that the republican parliament ventured formally to vote that the authors, the judges, and the executioners of that act had done their duty; to sanction the proceedings, and to order their insertion in the records of parliament.

Never did a people, vanquished by a revolutionary faction, and undergoing its overthrow without absolute insurrection, refuse more distinctly and positively to its conquerors its adhesion and its concurrence.

To the passive resistance of the country were soon added, against the government of the republic, the attacks of its enemies.

The first of these came from the republicans themselves. In the seventeenth, as in the nineteenth century, this name covered ideas, designs, parties profoundly various the one from the other. Behind the reformers of political order, came the reformers of social order, and then the destroyers of all order and of all society. To the passions and pretensions of religious fanaticism, blinder and more unbridled the lower you descend in the ranks of the party, the republic of Sidney and of Milton in no degree sufficed. The Levellers burst forth.

The Communists appeared. The republic had scarce been in existence six months, when already, around London and the parliament, four insurrections of sectarian soldiers, excited and sustained by an incessant fire of pamphlets, preachings, and popular processions, revealed its internal anarchy, and imperilled its government.

The royalist party took longer time to rise. Its repeated defeats, the execution of the king, the violent compression which had been weighing it down, had struck it with stupor. The dissensions of its conquerors, and the evident ill-will of the people towards the new government, soon restored it to life and to hope. Within two years, seven conspiracies and insurrections, the work either of the pure royalists, or of royalist presbyterians, alike fiercely hostile to the republic, proved to its chiefs that they had not with the same blow killed the king, and the empire of royalty.

Soon, between the royalist conspirators and the republican conspirators, between the Cavaliers and the Levellers, a secret correspondence was established. They conspired in concert, one common hatred superseded all special dislikes. And while England was struggling in this passionate anarchy, Scotland and Ireland, both royalist countries, though from very different motives, and with very different feelings, openly repudiated the republic, proclaimed Charles Stuart king, invited and received, upon their soil and at their head, the former Charles himself, the latter his representatives, and proceeded to make war for his establishment.

In this dislocation of the three kingdoms, amidst these plots at once opposite and combined, no sooner frustrated than revived, and which alternately raised and depressed, in every corner of the kingdom, the hopes and the fears, the ambitions and the machinations of all parties, the social bonds became relaxed, the springs of power were rapidly loosened. In county and parochial administration, in general or local finance, in public employments, in private fortunes, in every interest of civil life, there was an entire absence of order and of security. On the highways, around the towns, robbers multiplied, going about in bands, mixing up political passions with their crimes, demanding from those whom they stopped whether or not they had taken the oath of fidelity to the republic, and maltreating them, or releasing them unharmed, according to their answer.

For their suppression, it became necessary to station bodies of troops at different points, and to keep several regiments of horse constantly in motion; and the suppression, though energetically proceeded with, succeeded but very imperfectly, for the disorganization of society gave birth to disorders faster than the republican government could stifle them.

Assailed by so many and so great dangers, the chiefs of the republican parliament did not falter; they had all the energy and the pertinacity, some among them of faith, the rest of self-regard; their noblest hopes and their vilest interests, their honour and their life were involved in their enterprise. They devoted themselves to the work courageously; but in their anxiety to secure its triumph, they lavished with blind prodigality those means of a corrupt nature which only save a cause for a few days to involve it then in more utter destruction.

At their very outset, they carried political tyranny well nigh to its uttermost limits; for they decreed that whoever in the course of the civil war had sided with the king, or had shown any hostility to the parliament, should be held incapable of being elected member of parliament, or of occupying any post of importance in the state. And shortly afterwards the same incapacity was extended to every municipal function, and even to the simple right of voting at elections: thus placing, by a single blow, all the adversaries of the republic in the condition of Helots, excluded from every right, from all political life in their country.

The oath of fidelity had been, in the first instance, only required from civil functionaries and from ecclesiastics, and their refusal was attended with no other result than the loss of their posts. The infinite refusals incensed and disquieted the conquerors; to appease their anger, and in the vain hope of removing their disquietude, they imposed the oath upon every Englishman above the age of eighteen; and whoever refused to take it was no longer permitted to appear in a court of justice for the maintenance of his interests; so that political dissent involved civil incapacity.

Sequestration and confiscation were put in force against the conquered in a manner the most intolerable and revolting; upon no fixed or general principle, by partial, unsettled processes, aggravated or modified in severity according to the necessities of the moment, the avarice of a powerful enemy,

the most accidental circumstance, and by lists of names, in some cases very comprehensive, in others very limited, and all more or less arbitrary; so that none of those who felt themselves menaced, knew beforehand, with any approximation to certainty, what was his situation or what would be his fate.

Since the termination of the civil war one weapon alone remained to the vanquished, royalist, or levellers: publicity, the press. They used this daringly, as, throughout the whole course of its struggle with the king, the party now victorious had done. They might well think themselves entitled to do this, for the last censor of the monarchy, Mr. Mabbott, had given in his resignation, no longer choosing to be the instrument of such an abuse; and the first secretary of the republican council of state, Milton, had eloquently demanded the liberty of the press as the essential right of a free people. The republican government did not appoint a new censor; but they passed, as to the regulation of the press, a law which might well satisfy the most uneasy vigilance. Four towns only in England—London, York, Oxford, Cambridge—had the privilege of printing. No journal or periodical could appear without the authorization of the government, and the printers had to give security; and not only whoever had taken part in a seditious publication was incriminated and punished, but every purchaser of a seditious writing incurred a penalty, unless within four-and-twenty hours he placed the work in the hands of the nearest magistrate, and pointed out to him its dangerous tendency.

One liberty at least, religious liberty, might, it would seem, under the republic, expect a better fate. The republican secretaries had, from the outset of the republic, emblazoned it on their banner. Not only had they occasion to claim it for themselves, but their principles imperiously required it; for they repudiated any general or compulsory government in the church, and recognised in each separate congregation the right to govern itself. But by one of the most afflicting perversions of our nature, it is precisely there where it is most iniquitous and revolting—that is to say, in matters of conscience and of faith, that human inconsistency develops itself in its broadest aspect. The same party, the same men, who, for the past half century, had been devoting themselves with ad-

mirable steadfastness to the cause of religious liberty, and who put forward that liberty as the basis of Christian society, themselves become sovereign, now absolutely excluded from all liberty three great classes of persons, the Catholics, the Episcopalians and the Freethinkers. Against the Catholics the persecution had no limits; it was absolute proscription for their faith and their worship—for their laity, disqualification and privileged confiscation—for their priests, imprisonment, wholesale banishment, and death itself. The Protestant episcopal church, overthrown and dispersed by the Presbyterian parliament, found, under the republican parliament, the severity of its condition grievously aggravated; the sectaries made it the double victim of their vengeance and of their mistrust; oppression went the length of prohibiting, even in private families, the presence of its ministers, and the use of its liturgy and of its prayers. As to the Freethinkers—much more numerous at this period than is commonly supposed—if one of them, from imprudence or from scorn of hypocrisy, openly avowed his opinions, he was prosecuted, imprisoned, excluded from parliament, and expelled from any situation he held, however humble. The Presbyterians, as enemies of the Episcopalians, enjoyed a certain toleration, indeed, but it was limited in its extent, precarious in its tenure, and frequently disturbed by the suspicions or violences of the sectaries, who disliked them equally for their ecclesiastical organization and for their monarchical tendencies. It was in vain that, in the republican parliament, some men of a generous spirit sought to modify these reforms; they were soon taught, and fain to undergo, their own powerlessness. Under the republic, in short, there was no real religious liberty, except for the victorious republican sects, whose common union in one political cause, ever menaced with danger, made them forget or tolerate their dissensions in matters of faith.

To protect and sustain a political tyranny so extended and so harsh, judicial tyranny was indispensable. The republican parliament exercised it without scruple. The trial of the king—that monstrous derogation from all the principles and all the forms of justice, became the model of political trials. For the seditious of military levellers, martial law sufficed; but when a royalist insurrection or conspiracy broke out, a high court of justice, the members of which were appointed

by the parliament itself, was forthwith established; a true special commission, placed above, as to itself, all the rules, and as to the accused, all the guarantees of law. Was there any reason to apprehend that a knowledge of the proceedings would excite the anger or pity of the country? the publication was absolutely prohibited. Nor were these courts made use of merely against the more important personages handed over to their immediate jurisdiction; they were applied also as instruments against the obscure multitude, whom, in person, it was not practicable to bring before them. For example: before the republic was proclaimed, the Thames watermen had, in a petition, demanded that peace should be made with the king. After the king's execution, the parliament transmitted this petition, with their names affixed, to the High Court of Justice it had just appointed for the trial of five of the principal royalist chiefs; thus striking terror into the hearts of the humble by the same blow which struck off the heads of the great. Sometimes the employment of High Courts was deemed inexpedient; they might excite too much popular emotion, or involve too much of formal show, or be tardy in their work. In such cases the republican parliament itself acted as judges, inflicting, by a simple vote, enormous fines, the pillory, or banishment; now to prostrate some pertinacious foe, now to gratify the passions, or to cover the blunders of one of its own leaders. Did no pretext present itself for prosecuting and condemning the men they feared—for example, the first political reformers, whom the republicans had been able to conquer only by absolutely expelling them from parliament? they were arbitrarily seized, and dispersed in remote prisons. The Cavaliers, the Roman Catholics, the soldiers of fortune, all the Suspected, were banished from London, *en masse*. And if some royalist writer, instead of conspiring in secret, openly denounced to the country, by the voice of the press, the misdeeds, real or supposed, of the republican ringleaders, he was arrested and sent to the Tower, where, awaiting judgment, he died.

So much oppression, in the heart of so much anarchy, seemed all the more odious and intolerable that it was the work of men who had but just before, in the name of liberty, required so much from the king, and promised so much for themselves!—men of whom a large proportion were previously

unknown, obscure persons, proceeding from conditions of life wherein the people were in no way accustomed to recognise and to respect supreme power, and having no other title than their personal merit—a title pertinaciously contested until it had attained a position beyond all controversy and all comparison; and the material force at their disposal—a title offending and alienating even those who submit to it, until their conqueror has brought them to the point of thorough, prostrate degradation.

Despite the double intoxication of power and of peril, several of the republican leaders had the instinct of their position, and of the public feeling towards them. Powerful, they felt themselves isolated, and, to a large extent, scorned. There is no power potent to render a man indifferent to isolation, or insensible to scorn. They ardently desired to give themselves other titles to domination than civil war and regicide; to elevate themselves, by some great and national act, to the level of their fortune. They meditated and framed many reforms of internal government, in the laws, in the administration of justice, in taxation; but the most important of these, by no means indisputably meritorious in themselves, were energetically opposed by most of their leading partisans; and persevered in, so far from elevating the republic, they would but have plunged it still deeper in the ranks of the sectaries and levellers. It became evident that no measure of internal regulation could give the republican leaders that which they required. They directed their eyes abroad. It required little effort on their part, and involved no risk, to sustain, in their relations with foreign powers, the dignity and the interests of their country. The days of the wars of religion were well nigh passed away; those of political theories were not yet come. None of the great European governments, though all detested the new republic, thought of attacking it; each, on the contrary, sought to forestal its rivals in its friendship, or to make use of it against them. Simple neutrality would have sufficed to secure for England entire independence in her own internal affairs, and great weight in the affairs of the Continent. The leaders of the republican parliament aimed at more. Prominently before them were three powerful states, France, Spain, and Holland: the two former, as catholic and monarchical, the natural enemies—

their enmity more or less kept in check or disguised—of the new republic; the last, as protestant and republican, attracted towards England by all the sympathies of faith and of liberty. All at once an idea seized upon those daring and restless minds, and agitated them like a whirlwind: Why should not England and Holland unite in one sole, grand republic, soon subjecting all Europe to their common policy and their common faith? There was matter in this wherewith to please the most pious, wherewith to occupy the most ambitious. What gratitude would not the English people bear to the men who should thus aggrandize their grandeur, who should thus gratify their conscience and their pride! For such a consideration, monarchy would be soon forgotten, the republic be firmly established, and the republican parliament be permitted to become a senate of kings.

The work was at once essayed. The republican leaders laboured upon it with passionate ardour; some, by the medium of indirect influences, and by the dissemination of their idea in every corner of the kingdom; others, by solemn embassies abroad, whose business it was to lay the foundations of the future union of the two nations. But the day-dreams of revolutions are even still vainer, as to foreign relations, than as to the internal government of a state. The English republicans did not choose to reflect that in this fusion the republic of Holland would be absorbed in the republic of England, and that the republic of Holland might not be disposed to accept this absorption. It did not even accept its insinuation. The Dutch republicans, proved by a century of hard-earned success, were too proud to sacrifice their country, too prudent to sacrifice themselves, by uniting their destinies with this Utopia of a new-born and tottering republic. The cause of the English royalists, moreover, enjoyed in Holland the favour, not only of the House of Orange, but of the large body of the people, whose justice had been revolted by the murder of Charles I., as their common sense had been by the absurdities of the sectaries. The national pride of Holland dissipated with a breath the chimera to which the ambitious pride of the English parliament had given birth. But the failure of such attempts is never permitted to pass with impunity. From the present failure there resulted between the two nations, naturally rivals already, profound jealousy and mistrust; between their leaders,

the bitter rancour of wounded self-love. So agitated a source speedily swelled into the torrent of war, and the high diplomatic conceptions of the protestant and republican parliament of England had no other issue than a rupture and a fierce struggle with the only republican and protestant state among its continental neighbours.

Thus, from without as within, the English republicans had, from external events or from their own acts, the lie given most markedly and most mournfully to all their ideas and to all their hopes. They had promised liberty; they practised tyranny. They had promised the union and the triumph of protestantism in Europe; they had carried war into its very heart.

It was in vain that this government endured, or gained battles, or crushed its enemies: it strengthened itself not a jot. Amid all their successes, in the submission of all around them, the republic and its leaders declined, from day to day, into deeper and deeper discredit and degradation.

A man, the principal author of the death of Charles I., and of the establishment of the republic, Cromwell, who had foreseen this result, now prepared to profit by it. The king dead and the republic proclaimed, a vast, but perfectly natural, metamorphosis had taken place in Cromwell. Impelled, hitherto, by his passions, as a sectary and man of ambition, against the enemies of his faith and the obstacles to his fortune, he had wholly applied himself to their destruction. The work of destruction consummated, another necessity presented itself to his mind. The revolution was accomplished: a new government had now to be constructed. Providence, which rarely bestows upon one man a double power, had marked out Cromwell for both the one work and the other. The Revolutionist disappeared; the Dictator made ready.

At the same moment that this dominant necessity of the new situation of things became impressed upon his sound, powerful mind, Cromwell perceived further, that the government it was then sought to establish would never succeed: neither the institutions nor the men. The institutions had no unity, no stability; they had no past, no present, no future; the very heart of power was agitated with intestine war and permanent uncertainty. The men were men of narrow and chimerical views, of blind or petty passions; with them there

would be nothing but a perpetual revolutionary struggle between power and the people. Elevated into sovereigns, the republican parliament and its leaders were soon measured by the common sense of Cromwell, and found wanting. It was impossible that from them anything like a strong and regular government could proceed.

One resolve from that moment occupied the thoughts of Cromwell, never to mix himself up with the policy or with the destiny of those institutions and of those men; to keep wholly apart from their blunders and from their reverses; to separate from the parliament, by employing himself elsewhere as their servant.

To separate from it was nothing: the great point was to rise as others declined. Cromwell foresaw the downfall of the parliament and of its leaders; resolute not to fall with them, he set about the work of exalting himself beside them.

The great men of action never construct their plan of action beforehand or in one piece. Their genius lies in their instinct and their ambition. From day to day, in each circumstance as it occurs, they see facts such as they really are. They discern the path which these facts indicate, and the chances which that path opens to them. They enter it resolutely, and advance along it, still guided by the same light, as far as space opens before them. Cromwell thus advanced, on and on, to the dictatorship, without well knowing whither he was going, or at what cost; but onward still he went.

The position he sought, remote from, and independent of, the reigning power, the parliament itself offered him. The presence of Cromwell in London incommoded and disquieted the ringleaders. They asked him to go and take the command of the army, about to march for the subjugation of Ireland, risen well nigh as one man for Charles Stuart, or rather, against the parliament. Cromwell by no means yielded to a first or second application; he had to be entreated; he exacted infinite concessions;—first, for his friends, his patronage was zealous and vast; then for himself, he required great, sure means of success; well provided troops, distinguished honours, uncontested power. Everything he asked was given, so eager were they to get rid of him. His departure was solemn and magnificent. Sermons were preached predicting, under prayers to God, his success.

Cromwell himself preached and prayed in public, seeking and finding in the Bible allusions full of encouragement to the war he was about to wage. He quitted London, surrounded by a numerous staff of officers, splendidly equipped. At Bristol, where he stayed awhile previous to embarkation, the people from all the adjacent country flocked to see him as he took his departure. He omitted nothing, and nothing was wanting with him, to excite the public attention, to fill men's minds.

It was England he sought to gain by the subjugation of Ireland. Ireland was the country of a race and of a religion, the one scorned, the other detested, by the English people. Upon Ireland he waged war to the knife,—massacring, despoiling, driving out the Irish, hesitating no more at cruelty in the camp than at falsehood in the parliament, justifying the one as the other by the pretext of necessity, and prompt himself to credit the pretexts, that he might the sooner attain success.

The glory of his victories and of his name soon disquieted the parliament. Cromwell was in every one's mouth, the subject of universal conversation, the populace blindly admiring him, the politicians discussing his conduct and his future career. In Scotland, at the time of his departure for the army in Ireland, it was rumoured that it was to Edinburgh, and not to Dublin, that he designed to lead it, and the population was thrown into a state of excitement from one end of the kingdom to the other. Other rumours set it abroad that on his return from Ireland, he meditated to proceed to France, no one knew in what position, or to what purpose. Pamphlets were seized, entitled *The Character of King Cromwell*. Things had reached that point when the most trivial circumstances, the most ordinary proceedings on the part of a man, rising to greatness, excite to intensity the popular curiosity and the solicitude of his rivals. The parliamentary ring-leaders thinking to avail themselves of the winter quarters he had just established in Dublin, recalled him to London. Cromwell did not obey the order—did not even reply, but, suddenly resuming the campaign, pursued his work of destruction in Ireland, and did not consent to return to England until new and grave perils of the republic opened to himself new prospects of independence and of greatness.

Scotland had recalled Charles Stuart. The republic and the monarchy were about to meet face to face. The republic needed a tried champion to set against the king: it essayed to have two, Fairfax and Cromwell. Fairfax refused. The parliament nominated Cromwell alone, constrained with deeply painful reluctance, to give him, that he might save the republic, another kingdom to conquer.

In Scotland, Cromwell conducted the war and himself in a manner wholly different from that which he had observed in Ireland. As towards the Irish Catholics he had been violent, harsh, pitiless, so towards the Scottish protestants he was moderate, patient, conciliatory. In Scotland, around the royalist party, even within its ranks, there were deep-seated dissensions; presbyterians, fanatics rather than royalists, and who served the king mistrustingly and with infinite conditions and reservations; sectaries as ardent, as democratic as the English sectaries, full of sympathy with Cromwell and his soldiers, and more disposed to aid than to assail them. Cromwell applied all these tendencies to the best account, and while seeking to do battle with the king's army, exhibited every consideration to the country, negotiated separately with the leaders whom he knew to be wavering, or inclined rather towards himself, entered into correspondence, into conference, into religious controversy with the Scottish theologians; skilful to please, and leaving a favourable impression of himself even where he did not succeed in convincing or in decoying. He thus advanced into Scotland, gaining ground every day by his military successes, and by his influence over men's minds, and detaching from the king, one after another, counties, towns, and leaders. Charles found himself pressed upon, hemmed in, overtaken. With the impulsive energy of youth, he at once took a resolution, striking from its very desperation; he proceeded with his whole army, by a rapid movement, towards England, relinquishing Scotland to Cromwell, and resolute to try the fortune of royalty in the heart of the republic.

A month had not elapsed since Charles and the Scottish army had put their feet on English soil, before Cromwell overtook, defeated, and dispersed them at Worcester, where Charles had just been proclaimed king. Charles wandered from asylum to asylum, in one disguise after another, seeking a vessel to convey him out of England; and Cromwell re-

entered London in triumph, surrounded by members of parliament, by the council of state, by the common council, and by an enormous crowd, proclaiming him their liberator.

The great joy thus succeeding a great fear, got the better, for a while, of all jealousy, of all hate. The parliament heaped favours upon Cromwell: a large property in land was voted him; the palace of Hampton Court was assigned him as a residence; the men hitherto the most mistrusting him lavished upon him marks of their gratitude and deference. The enthusiasm of the republican community was more sincere, and of more value. The revolutions which have overthrown ancient greatness, are proud and eager to raise up new. It is their security, it is their highest gratification to see themselves consecrated in glorious images; it seems to them as though they are thus making reparation to the society whom they have despoiled of the original. Hence the instinct which, despite democratic passions, impels popular parties to those pompous manifestations, those measureless flatteries, that idolatry of language with which they ever delight to intoxicate the great men whom they see mounting upon the ruins they have made. Sectaries and philosophers, citizens and soldiers, parliament and people, all, of their own will or other people's, concurred to aggrandize Cromwell, as though to aggrandize themselves with him; and the republicans of the city of London, when they met and harangued him on his entering their walls, gratified their own vanity as they repeated to him: "Thou wert ordained to 'bind their kings in chains, and with links of iron' their nobles." Blind creatures, who little thought how soon these chains would weigh down their own hands! 1793

Cromwell received this homage and this greatness with a calculated sincerity, which yet was not wholly destitute of sincerity. "To God alone be the glory," was his constant reply; "I am but his feeble and unworthy instrument." He thoroughly understood how exactly this language suited his country and his party, and he exaggerated it and repeated it beyond measure, to gratify the men whose confidence and devotion he thus animated. But it was at the same time the expression of his own heartfelt thought. God, his power, his providence, his unintermitting action upon the affairs of the world and upon men's souls, these were not with Cromwell cold abstractions or obsolete traditions; they were his faith—

his deep, genuine faith: a faith, inconsistent indeed, and inexact, having but slight influence or check upon his actions in the temptations of life, and the necessities of success, but which subsisted in his heart's core, and gave inspiration to his words whenever the greatness of the circumstance or of his own situation thoroughly moved him. It is very easy besides to speak humbly and to call oneself the instrument of God, when God has made this instrument the master of nations. Neither the power nor the pride of Cromwell suffered from his humility.

17936.
Thus, the greater his position grew, the greater did his ambition grow with it, carrying him at last above his position. Through his so humble language, darted from time to time in his actions lightning gleams of sovereignty. At the field of battle of Worcester, he had the desire to knight, with his own hands, two of his bravest generals, Lambert and Fleetwood; and it was with great ill-humour that he gave up the notion, when he was reminded that this was a privilege of royalty. On the day of his triumphal entrance into London, as he advanced, amid the public acclamations, such was the expression of his countenance, that a man who knew him well, the sectarian preacher, Hugh Peters, said as he passed, "Cromwell will make himself our king." He had just saved the republic, and subjected to her two kingdoms. Out of London, and by the agency of arms, he had no further greatness now to do. He remained in London, powerful and unoccupied, receiving the constant visits of his officers and soldiers, the centre of all discontents and of all hopes. Before him was the republican parliament, so curtailed, that scarcely from sixty to eighty members could be got together from day to day; some of them earnestly and honestly occupied with public affairs, with the navy, with the Dutch war, with reforms projected in the laws—but the majority petty in their greatness, devoted to low passions, to sordid interests, monopolizing all the public employments among themselves and their relations, making their power subservient to their fortune and to their private animosities—a clique, day by day more selfish, more isolated, more decried; giving to the country neither repose, nor liberty, nor a future, yet manifesting entire determination to retain the sovereign power, as though the salvation of England could have required the perpetuation of so miserable a government.

Cromwell hesitated and waited a long time. At the very moment of his triumph, when he resumed his seat in parliament, he had commenced the struggle; two great and popular questions were his weapons—a general amnesty, proclaiming the civil war at an end, and an electoral law, regulating the mode and period of assembling a new parliament. These two measures had been proposed some time before, but they had remained buried in committees, merely brought forward from time to time, on critical occasions, by way of bait. Under the influence of Cromwell, they were seriously resumed and debated. The amnesty was carried with difficulty at the end of five months, after numerous attempts to introduce restrictions and reservations, chiefly of a pecuniary nature, all of which had been successfully opposed by Cromwell himself, too sensible to indulge in any useless animosities, and intent upon creating for himself in all parties supporters and personal friends. But the decisive measure, the electoral law, still remained in suspense. Cromwell urged it on, though without any particular earnestness, and rather to elicit for public observation the obstinate selfishness of the parliamentary ringleaders than to effect any speedy result. He was himself exceedingly perplexed. By what plausible means was he to constrain the parliament to dissolve? What would be the result of new elections? and would even new elections be sufficient to raise up and establish the country on a solid basis? Had the experiment of the republic succeeded? was it not still evident that monarchy was more in conformity with the laws, with the habits, with the feelings, with the permanent interests of the country? if the country desired it, if the country needed it, how reinstate it?

Cromwell put these questions, not merely in confidential conversations with some of the leading public men, but in conferences wherein he assembled officers of the army and members of parliament. He attained no satisfactory result: the officers insisted upon remaining republicans; the politicians inclined to monarchy, would hear of none other than the old monarchy, and counselled Cromwell to treat with it for its re-establishment. He would then break off the conversation, returning to the charge on some later occasion, pliant in appearance, but indomitable in his ambition; now frank to audacity, to lure men into his designs, at others crafty to effrontery, to conceal

them; from each successive interview he derived the advantage of more and more deeply compromising the army in his struggle with the parliament. The sectarian spirit was still potent in the army, and the military spirit had at the time strongly developed itself. The passions of the fanatic, and the interests of the soldier, combined there and mutually sustained each other; these Cromwell operated upon, incessantly inciting them against the parliament. What iniquity, that the pay of the conquerors should be withheld, and that men who had neither fought nor suffered should alone gather the fruits of victory! what an insult to God that the councils of his saints should be so little heeded! Petitions presented by the general council of officers in the name of the whole army haughtily demanded the payment of arrears, the reform of the abuses of the government, the satisfaction of the hopes of the people of God. The menaced parliament defended itself, grew angry, and at length assailed in its turn. It pressed forward the disbanding of a considerable portion of the army; it put up for sale the very palace of Hampton Court, which it had assigned to Cromwell as a residence!

This state of tension had already endured eighteen months. On both sides it was felt that the crisis approached. Who was to remain the master? All at once parliament took a resolution—the very resolution which was demanded from it. It vigorously resumed the discussion of the new electoral law. But that law had precisely for its object to perpetuate power in the very hands whence it should have withdrawn it. The present members of the republican parliament remained of right, without any re-election, members of the new parliament. Fresh elections were only to fill up vacancies in the assembly, according to the total number fixed by the law. And that nothing might be wanting to the security of the combination, the old members alone were to form the committee charged with inquiring into the new elections, and with the admission or rejection of the elected.

This was no dissolution of the parliament; it was a new lease. Cromwell no longer hesitated: abruptly breaking up a conference of officers assembled in his house, at Whitehall, he proceeded to the House of Commons, silently took his seat in the midst of the discussion, and at the moment when the electoral law was about to be put to the vote, he suddenly rose,

and with thorough brutality, profiting by the discredit into which the parliamentary ringleaders had fallen, to overwhelm them with gross insults, and insulting them grossly in order to place them in still deeper discredit, he signified to them, that they were no longer a body, drove them from the House by a company of soldiers, as intruders too long tolerated; and thus, at a blow, put an end to the Long Parliament. Not a man resisted, not a man raised his voice in opposition. Not that the expelled parliament had not friends, earnest and faithful, though few in number; but they had against them force and opinion. All the other parties, whether or not they approved of the act of Cromwell, rejoiced in it as in an operation of justice, and a deliverance. Intimidated or powerless, the defeated party quietly submitted; and those revolutionary ringleaders who had for nine years waged civil war, who had driven from parliament three-fourths of their colleagues, condemned their king to death, and tyrannically changed the constitution of their country, were now in a position to comprehend that the government of a people is a work infinitely higher and more difficult than they had imagined before they themselves succumbed beneath it. The republic had been established in the name of liberty; and under the domination of the republican parliament, liberty had been but a vain word, veiling the tyranny of a faction. After the expulsion of the parliament, the republic in its turn became a vain word, retained merely as one of those lies which still serve a formal purpose, though they no longer deceive the mind; and the despotism of a sole ruler was for five years the government of England. Despotism in great nations, which resort to it in a fit of perplexity or of lassitude, can only subsist upon two conditions—order and grandeur. Cromwell, become the master, exerted all the resources of his genius to impress upon his government both these characteristics. A stranger to the petty malignant enmities, to the narrow and impracticable prejudices which factions bring to their rule, he was willing that all, without distinction of origin, of party, cavaliers and presbyterians equally with republicans, provided they kept clear of political machinations, should have, in all the interests of civil life, protection and security. The act which imposed upon every Englishman the oath of fidelity, under penalty of incapacity to appear before the public tri-

bunals in assertion of his rights, was abolished. The administration of justice became once more regular, and as a general principle, impartial. Cromwell, general of the revolution, had always managed to keep up a correspondence and to have creatures in all parties. Cromwell, protector of the republic, sought to rally round his government the higher forces of society. Too sensible to separate himself from his roots, and to transfer himself to his enemies, a superior instinct warned him at the same time, that until power is accepted and supported by the men whom their position, their interests, their habits, render its natural allies, nothing is thoroughly organized or solidly established. The fierce, curbless chief of the popular innovators, now manifested himself full of respect for the institutions consecrated by time. In their aversion for human sciences, and for aristocratic or royal foundations, the sectaries wished to suppress the Universities of Oxford and Cambridge. Cromwell saved them. Great by nature, and now high by position, he assumed the taste for all that was high, for all that was great in past memories, in present intellect, and learning, and renown; he felt it his interest to attract all such around him, and he took a pleasure in protecting it against all low and petty hostilities. And he employed in support of this policy, in the maintenance, for the general benefit of order and of law, in the re-establishment, everywhere, of power and of respect for power, that very army with which he had overthrown so much ancient grandeur, and whose strict discipline, and whose personal devotion to himself, imperfectly and with difficulty kept in check the passions smouldering within it.

Abroad, in the external relations of England, Cromwell, freed from the yoke of parties, applied a juster judgment of the interests of his country and of his own situation, and attained a success still more thoroughly complete. Peace was the basis of his policy. From the very moment of his accession, he applied himself to its re-establishment or confirmation in every quarter,—with Holland, with Portugal, with Denmark; laying aside here those dreams of republican and protestant fusion which formerly he had himself conceived or fomented; there, religious or party grudges; eager to arrange differences, to settle disputed questions; at times exhibiting a haughty sensitiveness, in order to establish the dignity of a new govern-

ment, but always rational, indulging in no extravagant exactions, in no chimerical ambition, seeking abroad only that which was required for his essential interests, for the security and the strength of his power at home. Upon the same principle, peace once assured, the second basis of his policy was neutrality. Europe was now witnessing the crisis of the struggle between the House of Austria and the House of Bourbon,—between Spain, now declining, and France, now in rapid ascension. Each made earnest, and at times degrading, efforts to draw England into its alliance. Cromwell listened to both, giving to each enough of hope to obtain from it what he needed on behalf of his government, but pledging himself to neither cause. Upon a thorough consideration of the whole case, he judged that from Spain he had less to hope, less to fear, and much more to take. He had it in contemplation to give the power and the commerce of England a large field in the New World. He quitted neutrality in time and manner so happily selected, that while his war with Spain gave him beyond seas the conquest of Jamaica, his alliance with France procured for him, at the threshold of the European continent, the possession of Dunkirk, without his involving himself so deeply in the struggle of the two parties as to compromise the external independence of his country.

It was under his government the constant characteristic of his policy to keep itself free from system and from passion, and to meddle no further with other people's affairs than its own affairs really required. The Stuarts had taken refuge in France. The court treated them with favour, though hesitatingly. The essays at civil war of the Fronde agitated the kingdom. The protestants in it were, if not persecuted, disquieted and discontented. The opportunity seemed favourable, and the temptation was great, for Cromwell to intervene there against his enemies, and in support of the religious and political cause by which he had achieved his greatness. The Prince de Condé, chief of the insurgents, and the city of Bordeaux, their bulwark, earnestly solicited his aid, maintaining in his court enveys, who heaped entreaty upon entreaty, offer upon offer, to obtain his consent. Cromwell listened, gave some ground of hope, sent in his turn messengers and agents into France, commissioned to sound the dispositions and to measure the strength of the protestants and of the Frondeurs,

and thus seriously disquieted Mazarin; then, finding on the side of the French malcontents neither real strength, nor able conduct, nor chance of success, he laid aside all aspirations of ambition or of passion, let all the offers he had received, all the hopes he had encouraged, fall to the ground, and negotiated with Mazarin, putting to full profit all the uneasiness he had excited in the mind of that minister.

When, however, an opportunity, less tempting in itself, but at the same time less compromising, presented itself elsewhere for sustaining oppressed Protestantism, Cromwell seized it with avidity. To protect against the duke of Savoy, some poor peasants driven from their valleys, he multiplied declarations, embassies, money-aids, menaces; summoned the court of France to interpose, unless it desired that he himself should do so, involved in his proceedings the United Provinces and the Swiss cantons, attained his end solely by the movement which he put in operation, and thus gave the religious opinion of England a distinguished triumph, without involving it in any grave and dubious struggle.

When English interests abroad, important in themselves, though secondary, were at stake, claiming protection or reparation, Cromwell supported them energetically, keeping them carefully apart from general and more exciting questions. He sent into the Mediterranean Admiral Blake with a strong squadron, commissioned to proceed wherever England had demands or complaints to make; and Blake presented himself successively before Leghorn, Algiers, Tunis, Tripoli, settling in a brilliant manner, without aggravating them, the various disputes, and never withdrawing until he had obtained from free will or by compulsion, the redress of the grievances of his country.

Such earnest efforts, such great successes, did not remain wholly without result; but they did not effect the true and ultimate aim of the conqueror. This government, so energetic without temerity, so skilful in flattering the national passions without becoming their slave, which abroad aggrandized its country without compromising it, and at home maintained order by the soldiers of the revolution,—this government, Cromwell, was obeyed, feared, admired, but did not take root. England submitted to his genius and his force; she did not accept his domination. Consummate in the art of drawing

men to him, every day he detached a greater or less number from the ranks of the old parties, inducing some absolutely to enter his services, others at least to cease from acting as his enemies. He obtained, to the fullest extent that it has ever been attained by the masters of nations, all that good sense, weariness of resistance, personal interest, weakness, cowardice, sordid baseness, treachery, can give to power. But the old parties still subsisted,—cavaliers, presbyterians, republicans, compressed, but alive, and renouncing neither hope nor action. During the five years of Cromwell's rule, and omitting from consideration a host of obscure attempts, fifteen conspiracies and insurrections, royalist or republican, or coalitions of both parties, placed his government in alarm, and his life in danger. He repressed them energetically, alike without cruelty and without pity, rigorous or clement, according to the necessities of the moment, employing by turns the laws and arbitrary will, juries and exceptional courts, an indefatigable police, and a devoted army; silent arrests and signal executions; the banishment or the imprisonment of the defeated insurgents, or their sale in the colonies as slaves; everything that could be devised to strike enemies with impotence or fear. Nothing succeeded against him; all the plots were frustrated, all the risings in arms put down. The country took no part in them, and remained tranquil. But, at the same time, it had no faith in the right or in the duration of this daily victorious power. Cromwell did not reign in men's minds as a recognised and permanent sovereign. At the pinnacle of his greatness, he was still, in the public thought, nothing more than a master,—irresistible but provisional, without a rival, but also without a future.

He himself felt this more thoroughly than any one else. It was the characteristic of his mind to see all things, even his own position, such as they really were. Never was great man more ardent in hope, more entirely free from illusion.

He had learned, in overturning the constitutional monarchy, that it was the only government which suited England or could live there; master of the ruins of the edifice, an enduring idea took possession of him—to raise it up, and to establish himself within it.

It was his earnest desire, his constant labour, to effect a parliament with which he could live and govern. In five years

he called together no fewer than four; in some cases himself selecting, in concert with his officers, the assembly, whom he hypocritically invested with the name; in others, having it elected according to the new mode which the republican Long Parliament was on the point of adopting, when he expelled it from the house; always treating these assemblies in the outset with much solemnity of deference; putting in practice, to create majorities, artifices the most shameless, violence the most monstrous; and ever careful, in the very moment of breaking with them, to give them no idea that he renounced their co-operation.

The undertaking, on his part, was altogether chimerical. The royalists kept quite aloof from his parliament. The Presbyterians entered it, but in a very limited number. The various fractions of the republican party sat there in isolated batches, broken up and furious. The partisans of Cromwell were men little adapted to triumph by the means of parliamentary tactics and debate. His enemies, more practised in this class of combat, put into operation against him all its resources. He found himself there in presence of men whom he had dethroned, sincerely vehement against his tyranny, obstinate in their anarchical ideas and habits, and as ungovernable as incapable of governing. He himself, from day to day, supplied them with fresh and fresh weapons, in the shape of grievances; for he had not learned, in becoming absolute master, to respect right, or to endure opposition and contradiction. Warned by his acute instinct that in his despotic isolation he was establishing nothing, not even his own power, he would summon a parliament that he might make use of it in the creation of a durable government; but when the parliament was assembled, destitute of the natural force of the conservative party, and dominated by men whose only knowledge was to destroy, soon Cromwell, unable to endure either their liberty or their blind subserviency, would break in pieces the instrument he felt necessary, but which yet he was furious at finding ever fatal.

Once he thought he had, at least, succeeded in collecting a parliament that would comprehend and co-operate in his designs. He hastened to have laid before it the idea which possessed his mind, the complete re-establishment of the English monarchy, a king and two houses of parliament.

The proposition was formally made and discussed in the house, and publicly negotiated, for more than two months, between the parliament and the Protector. Cromwell displayed in the negotiation that strange amalgamation of ardour and of caution, of profound ability and of coarse hypocrisy, which constituted at once his art and his nature. In him prudence almost equalled ambition. He did choose that his accession to royalty should be at the price of a schism in his party,—that basis, already so narrow and so tottering, of his government. It was his aim to become king without imperilling the protector. He required, that not simply should the crown be offered to him, but that all the leading men by whom he was surrounded, sectaries or politicians, officers or magistrates, should distinctly commit themselves to the offer. For a long time past, before the institution of the Protectorate, before the expulsion of the Long Parliament, he had been sounding them and preparing them for such a result. Thoroughly engaged in this supreme enterprise, his labour, in operating upon them, was infinite and indefatigable; now straightforward, now indirect; he addressed himself, by turns, to their interest, to their friendship, to their reason; he sought to impress upon them that the revolution they had made, and their own position in common with his own, would remain weak and precarious until they had together established themselves in the constitution upon which were founded all the laws of England, with which were inseparably connected all the habits of obedience and respect of her people. He persuaded, or carried away, so many men, even among the long contumacious officers, that he might well think himself, and did really think himself, sure of success. The proposition was voted in parliament. The crown was formally and officially offered him. He postponed his reply: he desired to overcome all remaining opposition. This opposition he encountered close at hand, on the part of the generals most closely connected with his person. It was insurmountable; whether emanating from sincere attachment to republicanism, from very shame at giving so direct the lie to all their past life, or from the vengeance of humiliated rivalry. Cromwell flattered himself, that after all, these were but the fanciful humours of a few individuals. He had resolved to dispense with their consent, and to place upon his head the

crown which had been placed in his hands, when he learned that a petition, drawn up by one of his chaplains, and signed by a great number of officers, had, in the name of the army, been just solemnly presented to parliament, requiring fidelity to the good old cause, and protesting against the re-establishment of royalty. Cromwell instantly summoned the parliament to Whitehall, and affecting utter astonishment that they should thus appear to protest against his reply before it was given, he formally refused the title of king.

It was in vain that, enlightened by his genius as to the vice of his greatness, he sought to place it upon a basis consecrated by right and by time. God did not choose that the same man who had laid the king's head low, and trampled under foot the liberties of the country, should gather the fruit and enjoy the honour of the re-establishment of royalty and of the legitimate parliament. Potent against anarchy, Cromwell, in struggling with the difficulties of his situation, constantly fell into despotism. He had restored impartiality to civil order: impelled by the necessity of meeting the expenses of his government, he subjected all the royalists to the most iniquitous exactions, and the whole country to the rule of a military tyranny, the sole means of accomplishing those exactions. He prided himself upon having reinstated the administration of justice in all its regularity, in all its lustre; and when eminent advocates defended men against his prosecution, when upright magistrates refused to condemn those whom the laws acquitted, he maltreated, imprisoned, and drove them from their offices, with a degree of brutality altogether unexampled in the very worst times. It was over arrogance in him to suppose that he could re-establish legal monarchy without renouncing revolutionary violence. Cromwell already enjoyed a rare privilege; he had passed from the revolution to the dictatorship; it was not given him to transform the dictatorship into a rule of right and of liberty.

But his prudence did not desert him in this perilous trial. He had stayed himself only at the last moment, but he had stayed himself. England, which had witnessed the retrocession,—the republicans, who had enforced it,—still needed and still feared him. His position remained entire; and the protector was none the less powerful for having failed to make himself king. He did not abandon his design. He even set about preparing his measures for assembling a new parliament,

in the hope, doubtless, of one day quelling the army by the parliament, as heretofore he had quelled the parliament by the army.

But already the hand that was soon to quell himself lay heavy on him. His health had been for some time past giving way. A domestic affliction, the loss of a beloved daughter, aggravated his malady. He sank rapidly. He desired not to die: the many trials he had so triumphantly overcome, the great things he had done and that he contemplated to do, the power of his will, all contributed to persuade him that he had not attained the term of his life. He said to the more confidential friends about him, "I am sure I shall not die to-day; I know that God will not have me die yet." God had marked out Cromwell to be a striking example of what a great man can do and cannot do. His destiny was accomplished. He had rendered himself, by his sole genius, the master of his country, and of the revolution he had made in his country; he remained, to his latest hour, in full possession of his greatness; and he died, fruitlessly consuming his genius and his power in the attempt to reconstruct that which he had destroyed—a parliament and a king.

Amid the anarchy into which she was thrown by his death, England experienced one of those rare instances of good fortune, respecting which it is difficult to say whether they proceed from God alone, or whether man's wisdom has a share in them. The catastrophe of anarchy was in no way factitious or incomplete, or precipitate. All the ambitions, all the pretensions, all the elements of chaos and of political strife, that Cromwell had kept under, reappeared, and rushed tumultuously together upon the stage which he had filled alone. His son, Richard, was proclaimed protector without obstacle, and recognised by foreign powers without hesitation; but no sooner did he seek to govern, than around him arose a host of councillors, soon becoming his enemies and his rivals. The general council of officers; a new and more popular council of the army; a new parliament, which Richard immediately assembled; the old, mutilated Long Parliament, or, as the people called it, the Rump of the Long Parliament, which asserted that to it alone belonged the legal power, since it had received from Charles I.—the king it had put to death—the privilege of not being dissolved except by its own consent; and, lastly, this same Long Parliament, recruited by the members

whom, before the king's death, it had expelled, and who now re-entered it, as they had been dismissed from it, by force; all these spectres claimed to replace the master who of late had quelled them all; and England saw them, for more than twenty months, appearing, disappearing, flickering about, evoking or expelling one another, coalescing and combating, without any of them, for a single hour, assuming the stability or the strength of a government.

In this interregnum of twenty months—amid this ridiculous outburst of chimerical candidates—that candidate alone did not appear who to the universal thought of England, whether in hope or in fear, presented the only serious pretension. Scarce one or two insignificant movements, which merely demanded a free parliament, and did not venture to even utter the name of Charles Stuart, were essayed in his favour, and were at once suppressed without any difficulty.

It was the recollection of Cromwell which still kept the royalist party in fear and inaction. He had so repeatedly prostrated their hopes—had beaten down their insurrections and their plots with so hard a hand, that they no longer ventured eyes to think of success. Moreover, they had been taught wisdom by long enduring misfortune. They had learned not to take their will as the measure of their strength, and to comprehend that, if Charles Stuart was to recover the crown, it was the national interest of England, expressed by a national movement, that must restore it to him, and not an insurrection of cavaliers.

Richard Cromwell had the thought and the wish himself to terminate the general anguish and his own, by treating with the king. Without ambition or grandeur, he was deficient neither in capacity nor in probity. He had taken part in his father's destiny, rather from an indolent indisposition to oppose it, than from any confidence in it. He had no faith in the continuance of its success in his own person, and he felt himself incapable of supporting so great a burden. But neither was he capable of taking a decisive resolution upon such high concerns. He was weak and vacillating, overwhelmed with debt, and lost in vague speculations as to his future destiny. He remained the toy of a fortune, the vanity of which he thoroughly appreciated; the instrument of far less wise men than himself.

The catastrophe could not be long delayed. All the powers, all the names which had made the revolution, or which the revolution had made, had been tried, and tried over again. No external obstacle, no national resistance, had impeded them in their attempts to govern, yet all had failed, and all had well nigh sunk under the failure, all exhausted, in these sterile struggles, the little credit and the little strength they had managed to retain. Their nullity was laid bare. Yet England was wholly at their mercy. The nation had lost, in the course of these long and mournful alternations of anarchy and of despotism, the habit of itself regulating its destinies, and the courage to set about it. The army of Cromwell was still on foot, incapable of creating a government, but prostrating all that did not please it. One of its officers, high in the esteem and confidence of the soldiers, a stranger to political parties, who had done good service to the parliament, to Cromwell, and even to Richard Cromwell at his accession, Monk, foreseeing what must inevitably be the result of all this anarchy, applied himself to the task of guiding his wearied country to that goal, gently and without a struggle. There was nothing great in him; he possessed only common sense and courage. He had no yearnings for glory, no ambition for power; no lofty principles, no high designs, either for his country or for himself; but he was filled with a deep hatred of that disorder, of those measureless iniquities, which popular parties veil with fine promises. He was attached, firmly, ingenuously, unostentatiously attached to his duties, as a soldier and an Englishman. He was no mountebank, no declaimer; cautious, even to excess of taciturnity, he was absolutely indifferent to truth; and lied with imperturbable daring and pertinacity, whenever the expedient seemed promotive of what he deemed the sole, essential interest of England,—the peaceful return of the only government that could possibly be stable and regular in that country. He regarded all the rest as mere dubiety and party squabbling. He succeeded. All the fractions of the great monarchical party suspended, in order to give him their combined aid, their old hostilities, their blind impatience, and their opposing pretensions. The restoration was accomplished, as an altogether natural, as the only possible fact, without costing the conquerors or the conquered a single drop of blood; and Charles II., entering London amid the acclamations of enormous crowds, might well say:

"It has been certainly my own fault that I did not return long ago, for I have not seen a single soul to-day who does not swear that he always desired my return."

Never did government, old, or new, or raised up after a fall, find itself in a better condition to ensure regular strength and stability.

Charles II. ascended his throne without foreign aid, without internal struggle, without even an effort by his own party; by the sole impulse of the English nation, freed at length from oppression and from anarchy, and from revolutionary fluctuations, and which looked to him alone for legal order and a future.

The re-establishment of monarchy took place after the complete exhaustion, the decisive downfall of its enemies and rivals. The republic and the protectorate had appeared and re-appeared under all the forms, in all the combinations, they were capable of. All the powers, all the names issuing from the revolution, had fallen into utter disrepute and desuetude. The field of battle was clear. The very phantoms of the combatants, and of the revolutionary pretender, had vanished.

Royalty was not re-established by itself. Concurrent with the king's re-assuming his throne, the great landed proprietors, the country gentlemen, the leading citizens, who had supported the royalist cause, also resumed their places about the throne, and in the government. The republic and Cromwell had excluded them from public affairs, unable to endure their presence. Their return filled up a great void in the social organization. It is the common error of revolutionists to suppose that they can replace all they destroy, that they can suffice for all the requirements of the state. The English republicans had certainly abolished the House of Lords, and driven the royalist party from the political stage; but they did not succeed in themselves supplying its place, either for the support of power against the spirit of anarchy, or for the maintenance of the liberties of the nation against despotism. At the same time that it raised up the hereditary monarchy, the restoration reinstated landed property, family traditions, the old, high, territorial aristocracy of the country in all their rank and influence. Power thus recovered at once its principle of stability and its natural allies; and political society, for eleven years past broken up and fluctuating, re-entered upon the

possession of all its strength, and replaced itself upon its original basis.

The government of religious society, the Episcopal Church, raised its head at the same moment. No doubt, the origin of the Anglican Church, created as it was at the voice, and nurtured under the shadow of temporal power, has been a great source of weakness to it, as compared with the purely spiritual origin and the lofty independence of the Catholic Church. But England has derived from the circumstance this advantage, that all struggle has ceased between the government of the Church and that of the State: the Anglican Church, closely united with the throne, and deriving from the throne its original strength, has been constantly and loyally devoted to it; and despite the defect of its origin, and its infirmities of conduct, it has never been deficient either in fervour of faith, or in virtue of life, or in lustrous courage in the accomplishment of its mission. It has had its heroes and its martyrs, indomitable on the scaffold and at the stake, though but too frequently weakly yielding to the sovereign. When it was re-established, in 1660, with Charles II., it had, for fifteen years, undergone every description of revolutionary persecution, spoliation, the oppression of its worship, insult, imprisonment, poverty. It had supported all this with dignity and steadfast constancy; it rose up amid the impassioned devotion of the royalist party, and the general respect of the people, and brought to the service of royalty tried fidelity, and an authority aggrandized by misfortune.

The disposition of the English people entirely corresponded with that of the Church; not that the sects it had long oppressed, and which had been just oppressing it in their turn, had ceased to be fiercely hostile to it; not that the odious and ridiculous excesses of fanaticism everywhere gave way to a wise and true piety. A reaction of impiety, frivolity, licence, and utter indecency was not long in breaking out. But this scarcely penetrated beneath the upper, superficial regions of society. Amid the undisguised vices of the court, and of the classes immediately, from vicinity, subject to the contagion of its example, England remained full of sincere and fervent Christians; one portion attached, or brought back, to the Anglican church by the recollection of the evils, and by hatred of the disorders which its fall had involved; the rest, con-

nected with the dissenting sects, whom the church once more began to persecute, cruelly enough to exalt their zeal, but not enough to strike them to death. In the very heart of their struggles and mortal hatreds, the church and the sects exerted a salutary influence upon one another; they reciprocally maintained, and recalled to each other respect for God and his law, a constant striving for the eternal interests of man, and the fervour and activity of faith.

Thus, in the masses of the population, there was no want of moral basis for the re-established monarchy, while it found the political support it required in the classes habitually in contact with power.

Two formidable enemies, the spirit of revolution and the spirit of re-action, could alone render vain so many propitious circumstances, and again compromise the monarchy. The spirit of revolution long survived its defeat, and even the exposure of its utter impotence. Of the two revolutionary parties which had ruled in England, the republic and Cromwell, the latter had completely passed away; so completely, that the sons of the protector were left at liberty to die in peace, forgotten in their own country. The republican party subsisted without essaying, and almost without hoping, anything for its own cause; but ardently mixed up with all the hostilities, all the plots against the established government; incessantly seeking and finding insurgents and martyrs among the persecuted sects, particularly in Scotland. Even among the parties of constitutional opposition, strangers to any republican regrets or desires, revolutionary ideas and habits still remained potent: the more enlightened had their minds imbued with theories, and their hearts prone to the emotion of passions incompatible with the patient struggles and the compulsory negotiations inseparable from constitutional monarchy; the more moderate calculated the chances, and glided down the inclined plane of new revolutions, with a facility opposed to all stable and legal order. The revolutionary venom, deadened, but not expelled, still circulated in the veins of a large portion of the English nation, and kept it in a state of political intemperance, pregnant with obstacles and perils to power.

The spirit of reaction, that disease of conquering parties, incessantly fomented the spirit of revolution; not that we

ought to adopt all the reproaches with which history pursues, in this respect, the cavaliers and the Church of England. Revolutions long sovereign, and at last arrested in their course, have this arrogant pretension, that the iniquities they have committed remain intact; men must be content to restrain thenceforth their maleficent power; they characterize as re-action all reparation of the ills they have done. Among the measures adopted in the reign of Charles II. to redress the wrongs which the royalists, lay and ecclesiastical, had suffered during the revolution, many were only a natural and necessary return to violated right and law. But these returns have limits, which good sense will point out for the guidance of governments, and the interest of parties themselves. We must not repair injustice by injustice; nor put an end to revolutions by provocation and vengeance. All reparation which assumes this character loses its right, and seriously endangers the cause it pretends to serve. The religious re-action, especially, fell, under Charles II., into deplorable excesses. It was not a simple redress of the grievances and misfortunes of the Anglican church; it was a vindictive persecution of the dissenting sects, a want of faith towards the more moderate of these sects, to whom the king, at the time of his return, had solemnly promised liberty. Charles several times attempted to keep his word, and to secure some degree of toleration to the dissenters; his good sense recoiled from persecution, equally with the gentleness of his manners, his indifference in religion, and his secret tendencies in favour of the catholics. But his weak and transient fits of justice soon gave way before the obstinacy of ecclesiastical hatred and the fury of popular passions, with which the royalist party, blinded or hurried away, were almost all associated, both in and out of parliament. After 1660, the lay re-action was limited and of short duration; but religious re-action, for a moment restrained, soon broke out with violence, and perpetuated itself in an aggravated form, and created most of the dangers and faults, I might say the crimes, into which Charles II. and his government fell.

But these faults and these perils, though great and sad, had about them at bottom nothing vitally menacing to the English monarchy and society. Considered as a whole, the spirit of revolution no longer possessed, the spirit of re-action no longer

dominated, England. After the great revolutionary crisis of 1640-1660, the English people had the good fortune and the merit of appreciating experience, and of never giving themselves up to the extreme parties. Amidst the most ardent political struggles and violence, in which they sometimes followed, to which they sometimes impelled, their chiefs, they always on great and decisive occasions reverted to that sound good sense which consists in recognising the essential benefits it is desired to retain, and attaching itself without wavering to them; enduring the inconveniences attendant on them, and renouncing the desires which might compromise them. It is from the time of Charles II. that this good sense, which is the political intelligence of free nations, has presided over the destinies of England. Three great results, as yet confused and incomplete, but irrevocable, alone essential to the wishes and to the general interests of the English people, survived the revolution which it had gone through.

Royalty could no longer separate itself from parliament: the cause of monarchy was gained, that of absolute monarchy was lost. Theologians and philosophers, as Filmer and Hobbes, might erect absolute power into a dogma, or maintain it as a principle; and, in writings or in conversation, their ideas might excite the favour or anger of men of science and party; but in the practical thought of the nation the question was decided: royalists or revolutionists, all regarded the intimate union and mutual control of the crown and parliament as the right and necessity of the country.

The House of Commons was, in fact, preponderant in parliament. Its direct sovereignty was no longer the question; this revolutionary principle had fallen into utter discredit, was accursed; the crown and the House of Lords had resumed possession of their rights and of their rank, but they had been too roughly beaten down to acquire again all their ancient superiority, even by the fall of their enemies; and neither the faults nor the reverses of the House of Commons entirely effaced the memory of their terrible victories. The royalist party, now become masters, inherited, in its relations with the crown and in the administration of the state, the essential conquests of the Long Parliament. The confusion was necessarily of long duration, and often violent, before the different parties, whig and tory, government and opposition, had learned to

make a good use of these acquisitions, to comprehend thoroughly their meaning and extent, and to maintain among the great public powers that laborious harmony which constitutes the merit and the difficulty of constitutional government. But amid the experimentings of this apprenticeship, and despite frequently contradicting forms and appearances, the preponderating influence of the House of Commons became, from the time of Charles II., a more and more evident and assured fact.

By the side of, or rather above, these two political facts, was the religious fact also consummated by the revolution, the complete and decisive domination of protestantism in England. The English protestants had certainly never been more thoroughly disunited; and Bossuet might well allow himself the proud gratification of contemplating and describing their discords and their contests. But the unity of a common faith and passion still lived in sects separating from each other in every direction; amidst all their own battles, all professed the gospel, and all combated catholicism with equal ardour. Liberty of conscience, constantly forgotten, and oppressed among and by them, was, as against the Romish church, equally dear to them, and irrevocably vindicated.

This was all that the English nation, in its general and inmost thought, demanded from the ancient royalty, whose return it welcomed with transport, ready long to endure the faults of the government which should preserve it from any new revolution, by assuring it these three results of the revolutions it had undergone.

But this was precisely what neither Charles II. nor James II. could or would accomplish.

In politics, Charles was too sensible and too indifferent to affect or practise absolute power. He only cared for his pleasures, only loved power for the enjoyment it gave of life, and willingly listened to concession and conciliation, that he might thus ward off the peril of extreme struggles, or spare himself annoyance; but in his heart he admired and relished only absolute monarchy. He had suffered from the rigorous principles, he had witnessed the errors and defects, of his country's institutions; he had contemplated, nigh at hand, the splendour of the court of Louis XIV., and the vigour of his government. Thither his admiration and trust were directed. Hence his

tendency to fall into venal servility to Louis XIV.; he regarded him as the chief of the party of kings, and did not feel the shame which should have overwhelmed him, when he sold to him the policy and the liberties of his country.

In religion, Charles was at once sceptic and Roman catholic; believing nothing, and as corrupted in spirit as in morals; but thinking that, after all, if there was any truth in religion, it was to be found in the catholic faith,—a safer shelter for kings against the perils of power; for men against those of eternity.

Thus, though in his life he did not demean himself as an absolute and catholic sovereign, Charles was at heart catholic and absolutist; sympathizing with the kings of the continent, and not at all with the faith and policy of his nation.

James II. was a catholic and absolutist by faith, and his conduct was in keeping with his faith; blindly enterprising, moreover, with all the obstinacy of a narrow and sterile mind, and the hardness of a cold, passionless heart.

Such were the two princes whom the Restoration introduced to the English nation, resuming with delight the monarchy, and cursing the Revolution, while instinctively resolved to hold fast by its great results.

The history of England, during the whole course of the Restoration, is only the history of the profound disagreement, slowly manifesting itself, and at last breaking out, between two kings and their people, and of the persevering efforts of the English people to escape from the consequences of this fact,—that is to say, a new revolution.

For England, during this epoch, was essentially conservative. Ardent factions and selfish ambitions agitated her with their intrigues, their plots, their insurrections. She was more than once carried away by their efforts, or by her own passions, into movements to all appearance revolutionary. But far from seconding the men who sought to overturn the Stuart monarchy, she stopped short and recoiled when she perceived this tendency. In the reign of Charles II., conspirators and insurgents were only minorities disagreeing with the country, even at the moment they were receiving some degree of favour from it. In proportion as the restored royalty committed more faults, and exhibited more clearly its designs and tendencies, the public discontent grew greater, the chances of a rupture between the prince and the country stronger; but the

country struggled against the chances instead of seeking them. For twenty-six years, the English nation, to maintain the House of Stuart on the throne, without yielding up its laws and religion, made every sacrifice, every effort, that the most patient and sustained conservative spirit could make.

All the phases of the English government during this epoch—the conduct and the destiny of all the parties and of all the ministries that exercised power, were only so many various forms and striking instances of this great fact.

From the natural tendency of things, the old royalist party, the faithful councillors of Charles I. in misfortune, and of Charles II. in exile, were the first in possession of power. Clarendon was their chief. Of a firm, upright, and penetrating mind, the sincere friend of legal and moral order, courageously attached to the constitution, and passionately to the church of his country, full of respect for the rights, written or traditional, of the people as of the prince, he detested the Revolution to such a degree, that all novelty indiscriminately was matter of suspicion and odium to him. As prime minister, he was rather haughty than proud; he wanted greatness in his ideas, and sympathetic generosity in his character, and enjoyed his grandeur with pomp, as he exercised his power with stern unbendingness. With the king, who felt for him an esteem full of confidence and mingled with some attachment, he was alternately severe and humble, passing from remonstrance to compliment; speaking and maintaining the truth as an honest man, but uneasy at having spoken it; and seeking support against the court, without wishing to draw his power from the parliament. He aimed at once to maintain in the crown respect for the ancient laws of the country, and in the House of Commons the unassumingness of its ancient position; and flattered himself that the royal prerogative might be kept within the bounds of legality, and yet have no necessary responsibility to parliament imposed upon it. He failed in this chimerical attempt to found, at the starting point from a popular revolution, a government which should be neither arbitrary nor limited; and, after seven years' sway, he himself sank, odious to the commons for his monarchical arrogance, to the dissenting sects for his episcopal intolerance, and to the court for his disdainful austerity; pursued by the blind wrath of the people, who attributed to him all the public calamities

and all the wrongs of power; and unworthily abandoned by the king, to whom he had become only an inconvenient censor, and a compromising minister.

Clarendon's fall has been attributed to the defects of his character, and to some defects or some checks in his policy abroad and at home. This is to misapprehend the greatness of the causes which decide the fate of eminent men. Providence, which imposes on them so rude a task, does not treat them with such rigour as not to pardon them some weaknesses, or as lightly to overthrow them for some particular faults or checks. Other great ministers—Richelieu, Mazarin, Walpole—have had defects, and committed faults, and experienced reverses, as serious as those of Clarendon; but they understood the time in which they lived, and the views and efforts of their policy were in keeping with its wants—with the state and general tendency of men's minds. Clarendon deceived himself as to the age in which he lived; he mistook the meaning of the great events which he had witnessed; he considered and treated what had passed between 1640 and 1660 as a revolt, after the suppression of which there was nothing to do but to re-establish order and the laws; not as a revolution, which, precipitating English society into mournful frenzies, had launched it on new paths, and imposed on the old royalty, in its restoration, new rules of conduct. Among the great results which this revolution, even in its defeat, bequeathed to England, Clarendon accepted with sincerity the necessary co-operation of the parliament, and, with joy, the triumph of protestantism. He repudiated and obstinately combated the growing influence of the House of Commons on the government of the country, and could neither appreciate nor practise the means by which this new fact might be applied to further the security and even the power of the monarchy. This was one of those errors which no talents, no virtues, however great, can compensate; and which, in the pitiless destiny of public men, render fatal, errors and reverses, otherwise trivial and of little importance.

After the honest councillors of the ancient royalty came the profligates of the new court, with Buckingham and Shaftesbury at their head: the former, licentious, intellectual, giddy, and presumptuous; the other, ambitious, profound, and daring; both equally corrupt and skilled in the art of corrupting; both

ready, at the bidding of their fortune, or their vanity, to pass incessantly from the court to the multitude, and from the government to faction. They undertook to satisfy parliament, the dissenters, all the public sentiments which the stern and self-isolated policy of Clarendon had irritated. But to wish to please, and to yield, are not all that is requisite to govern. The daring and immoral successors of Clarendon did not suspect what embarrassments and dangers they were about to draw down upon power and upon themselves, in taking the House of Commons as their fulcrum. For a popular assembly to be the habitual medium of a strong and regular government, it must be itself powerfully organized and governed, which can only be, when it contains great parties united by common principles, and progressing with continuity and discipline, under recognised leaders, to a definite goal. Now such parties only form themselves, only subsist, where men are allied and bound together by powerful interests, and by firm and long entertained convictions. A certain measure of faith in ideas, and of fidelity to persons, is the vital condition of great political parties, as great political parties are the condition of a free government. Nothing like this existed, or was in a condition to be formed under Charles II., when the ministry called the Cabal endeavoured to govern in concert with the House of Commons, and according to its views. After so many shocks and blunders, and especially in the vicinity of power, men were a prey to doubt, to mistrust, to constant fluctuation, to a spirit of personality; now impatient to indecency, now prudent to pusillanimity. The House of Commons was chiefly made up of the wrecks of revolutionary parties; there were no political parties capable and worthy of sustaining a government. And men like Shaftesbury and Buckingham were incapable and unworthy of forming such parties; their only idea was to seek and to gain for themselves, by every and any means, partisans in every camp. This policy was shamelessly incoherent and contradictory; now they united England in the closest ties with Holland; now delivered Holland up to Louis XIV., according as they felt, for the time, need of the favour of the zealous English protestants, or of that of the great foreign king. They gave toleration to the dissenters, apparently out of respect to the rights of conscience, but in reality out of complaisance to the king, who wished to

protect the catholics; then, under the pressure of the irritated House of Commons, they solicited the king to sanction the most rigorous measures against the catholics and dissenters. Their policy, internal and external, displayed only a series of futile gropings in the dark; their most equitable measures were only means of corruption and deceit, insolently, and without shame, alternately adopted and abandoned; equally deficient in solidity and in sincerity.

The public, within as well as without the House of Parliament, were at times caught in these snares. There is no tendency so eager as that of popular passions to believe what pleases them, and to excuse everything in him who serves them. The profligates of the Cabal for a time obtained some favour, but it was withdrawn from them as rapidly as it had been given. Their licentious life, the known wickedness of their opinions, the versatility of their conduct, the futility of their promises, shocked the moral sense of the country, which, amid all these scandals and blunders, retained a solid foundation of faith and virtue. It would, assuredly, have done more than felt indignation, had it known that its king, with the connivance of his principal councillors, had concluded secret treaties with Louis XIV., by which he engaged to declare himself catholic so soon as he could safely do so; and, in the meanwhile, sold, for a few millions, the independence of the policy and of the institutions of his kingdom. England was long ignorant of these ignominious acts; but when mistrust is deep, public ignorance has instructors which, while they sometimes mislead, sometimes also wonderfully enlighten the people. Without knowing to what extent the ministers of the Cabal were degrading and betraying their country, the House of Commons not only did not place itself in their hands, but, in the end, attacked them furiously; and they fell under the blows of a power which they had aggrandized and flattered, in order to make use of it, but without having made any progress towards the organization of political parties in parliament, and their regular action in the government.

Their successor, Sir Thomas Osborne, Earl of Danby, had far more political genius and more influence in the development of the parliamentary principle in the government of his country. Entering public life under the auspices of the Cabal, and early associated with some of their evil practices, he differed

essentially from them, for he came from the country, not from the court. A country gentleman from Yorkshire, the country gentlemen were really his party, and the House of Commons his political country. He ardently sustained the cause of the crown and its power, but united it with parliament, instead of isolating it. He applied himself, by every means, good and bad, by persuasion, by the purchase of votes, to form a compact parliament party in the House of Commons; and to establish between his party and the administration that solid intimacy which alone can render power efficacious and powerful, by guiding its various elements to one same thought and one political action. Besides, in matters of religion and of external relations, Danby understood and shared the national feeling of England; he desired the security of protestantism and the good understanding between the English government and the powers devoted to that cause. He induced Charles II. to conclude, first, peace, and then alliance, with Holland, and to give his niece, Mary, in marriage to Prince William of Orange. Thus Danby, abroad, provided a future saviour for the faith and liberties of his country, while at home he began to give a solid form to that great party of the royal prerogative and of the church, which, since that epoch, has communicated such power to the English monarchy, and so powerfully contributed to its stability.

And by a happy combination of opposite results, while the sound judgment and ability of Danby organized the tory party, his faults caused the whigs to take an energetic and salutary development. It is to the honour of the whigs that they drew their origin and the first impulses of their greatness, from the defence of the liberties and the political morality of the country. Their party sprung to life under the invocation of generous principles and sentiments. It was in the contests against Danby and his army of Cavaliers, transformed into tories, that it began to assume its form and lustre—contests, irregular and confused, but which developed clearly two great parliamentary parties, both aspiring to the government of the country, in order to put into practice systems of policy really diverse, in virtue of principles, not essentially hostile, but profoundly different.

Sustained during four years, this struggle resulted in the fall of Danby, in the dissolution of the royalist Long Parlia-

ment, which, for eighteen years, with a singular mixture of devotion, servility, and independence, had constituted the force of royalty, and in the formation of a great whig ministry, in which the heads of the party,—Temple, Russell, Essex, Hollis, Cavendish, and Powlet, with the aid of Halifax, the head of the moderates, and of the daring renegade from the court; Shaftesbury, become the popular favourite—undertook to reform and conduct the government.

The circumstances were grave. For the first time, and despite the long resistance of the crown, the parliamentary opposition achieved power in the name of public opinion and of the majority. Would it be able to exercise it, to maintain itself in it? Would it satisfy the real wants of the country, without shaking the foundations of the monarchy, disquieted by its accession?

The whigs did not succeed in solving the problem.

Whether from want of experience, or from the influence of the false political theories with which the revolutionary Long Parliament had been imbued, their ideas as to the organization and conditions of constitutional government were confused, impracticable, full of hesitation and contradiction. They were subject, at the same time, to monarchical prejudices and to republican prejudices. They essayed to constitute the cabinet on a broad basis, so as to make it a sort of intermediate body, capable of restraining the crown by the parliament, and the parliament by the crown. An ill-conceived essay, abortive at its birth. They carried the spirit of opposition into the exercise of power, and while serving royalty, were more intent on defending themselves from it, than on supporting it.

They were mixed up with the wrecks of the anarchical factions which had survived the revolution, and which never ceased covertly to attack the monarchy. Well nigh null in the elevated classes, the republican party was too weak and powerless to ensure itself success even with the multitude; but it possessed fierce conspirators and agitators, ready to place their skill and their lives at the service of any one who gave them, or led them to expect, the satisfaction of their turbulence and of their enmities. The whigs were constantly, if not in connivance, at least in contact with those professional revolutionists, whom they desired to make their soldiers, but

who, in their turn, looked to make their leaders their tools, and constantly compromised them, first with the king, and then with the country, monarchical, though discontented, and decidedly opposed to new revolutions.

Against these errors of their conduct, and these difficulties of their position, the whigs had one resource, of which they made ample and deplorable use — obsequiousness to the popular passions. England, at this epoch, had one general, dominant passion, terror of; and aversion to, popery. Warned, by a legitimate instinct, that they were, in this respect, betrayed by the king, the English nation overstepped all bounds of reason, justice, and humanity. For three years, political and judicial persecution of the catholics was the crime of a people furious in its faith, and of a king pusillanimous in his incredulity. The whigs joined, or, like the tories, yielded to, the madness. They had, moreover, the ill fortune to attain power, when the first fever of national fury against the catholics was beginning to cool, and was giving way to a movement of re-action in favour of good sense and equity. They thus, more than their rivals, bore the weight of this re-action, and of the secret anger of the king, who took pleasure in revenging upon them the iniquities he had not had the courage to resist.

As to the foreign relations of the country, their situation was not less complicated or more secure. Whilst they were denouncing the servile intimacy of the king with the court of France, several of their leaders were themselves receiving pensions and favours from Louis XIV.: some from corruption, for the popular party had its profligates, as well as that of the court; others, full of patriotism and honour, in the chimerical hope of employing the means of influence they derived from a foreign sovereign to the triumph of the liberties of their country. It is a dangerous experiment to seek abroad a secret force wherewith to operate upon the internal affairs of one's country,—the ablest diplomatists incur hence the risk of serving rather the designs of the foreigner than their own; and Louis XIV. profited much more in his policy, from his relations with some of the whig leaders, than they did from the covert support he gave them in overturning Danby, and obtaining the dissolution of the cavalier Long Parliament.

In this position, replete with embarrassments and perils for them, the whigs undertook to change the order of succession to

the throne, and, by an act of parliament, to exclude the legitimate successor. This was making a revolution by anticipation, in virtue of conjectures, well founded, indeed, but remote; the absolute necessity of which was not demonstrated by actual, manifest facts. No doubt, the whigs thought that, in such a matter, it was better rather to be premature than too late; to accomplish at once, by the medium of legal deliberation, that which it would be necessary to do, later, by force, and perhaps at the expense of a civil war. A very superficial view, exhibiting, on their part, little knowledge of men and of the great conditions of social order. It is a much more serious matter to discuss, than to accomplish, a revolution; and the state is much more profoundly shaken by attacking its fundamental laws, in the name of human reason, than by infringing them with the hard blows of necessity. What the whigs demanded of parliament was, that, of its sole will, and before James II. had begun to reign, it should abolish his hereditary right to the crown—that is to say, in principle to make the basis of monarchy subordinate to the opinion of parliament. The public instinct warned England that this would be to ruin the monarchy itself; the monarchical spirit awoke with a start; discord broke out in the very heart of the cabinet. The whigs lost all their allies among even the moderate tories, and found themselves reduced to the forces of their own party. They, moreover, found themselves faced by an obstacle scarcely foreseen,—the conscience of Charles II. This selfish prince did not think himself entitled to dispose of his brother's right, and defended it at all risks. To the honour of the English people, the popular passion checked its course in homage to legal power; the bill of exclusion, adopted by the House of Commons, was thrown out by the House of Lords, and no attempt was made to proceed with it, or to triumph by other means.

But still the question remained high on the horizon. The House of Commons which had voted the exclusion of James II. was dissolved. In that which succeeded, the bill was proposed and carried anew. The two great parties, which had slowly formed in the course of the reign, were resolved, the whigs to set aside the future monarch, the tories to maintain the monarchy intact. Charles also took his resolution; he dissolved the House of Commons, dismissed the whigs, formed his council of tories alone, and governed four years without a parliament,

mournful years, which England passed listening to the muttering of the approaching storms. Again in opposition, the whigs conspired, with different projects and in different degrees; some, legally to recover power; some, to compel the king, even by insurrection and a civil war, to submit to what they deemed the right and wish of the country; some, the inferior and desperate soldiers of the party, wished, at any cost, even by assassination, to get rid of the king and his brother, the only obstacles to the success of the cause. These plots, sometimes exaggerated, sometimes confused by imperfect publicity, and by prosecutions conducted with subtle iniquity, spread various dismay throughout the country. The conservative party was indignant, alarmed for the safety of the throne and of established order; the popular party became more and more incensed to see all its attempts frustrated, and its noblest leaders delivered up to the scaffold. Monarchical reaction and destructive hostility grew side by side. The charters of the towns and principal corporations, the last ramparts of the popular party, were judicially attacked and abolished. The conspirators, feeling their weakness and danger, left the country, and went to Holland, to conjure the Prince of Orange to save the protestant faith and the liberties of England. It was clear that, of the three great results of the Revolution which England was bent on preserving, the two political results, the influence of parliament on the government, and the preponderance of the House of Commons in parliament, were suspended and dangerously compromised; the religious result, the domination of protestantism, remained as yet intact. It was the Anglican church herself that invariably supported the crown, and struck with anathema every attempt at resistance. Strong in this support, the high tories, directed by Rochester, drew daily closer round James, forgetting his devotion to the catholic church, and only seeing in him the heir and representative of monarchy. But a third party formed round Halifax, combating violent measures, demanding that parliament should be assembled, and predicting extreme perils if this course was not adopted. Charles hesitated and procrastinated, promising the high tories that he would sustain the rights of his brother with unshaken perseverance; the moderates, that he would respect the constitution of the country; the church, that he would support the protestant

establishment. Perplexed and wearied, employing all his remaining address and skill in eluding the necessity of choosing from amongst his promises, he died before events imposed this necessity on him; but when he arrived at the term of life, and stood on the threshold of eternity, the fears of the dying man overcame the precautions of the king; he rejected the entreaties of the English bishops; he summoned a Benedictine monk, who was concealed in the palace, and died in the bosom of the catholic church; confirming, at his last hour, his country in the suspicions against which he had constantly sought to defend himself, and his brother in the resolution to live devoted to that church out of which Charles, notwithstanding his sceptical indifference, had not dared to die.

During his reign of four years, James II. had no other thought. It was not from the mastery of a strong and dominant nature, nor to satisfy a passionate ambition; it was from an utterly blind and intractable fanaticism, that he insisted upon absolute power. The principle which forms the basis of the infallibility and independence of the supreme power, was in his eyes a maxim of government as well as an article of faith. In his hard, narrow mind, temporal and spiritual order were blindly confounded; and he thought himself, as king, entitled to exact from his subjects in the state, the same absolute submission which, as a catholic, he was himself, in the church, bound to practise.

From his infancy, he had seen those who shared his faith, and himself, on account of his faith, cruelly oppressed. Become king, he regarded the deliverance of the catholic church in England as his duty and his mission; and he comprehended no other mode of accomplishing her deliverance than by restoring her domination.

By a sad concatenation of human errors and iniquities, mutually evoking and engendering each other, instead of recognising and respecting their mutual rights, protestants and catholics only thought of persecuting and enslaving one another.

Whether in the sincere hope of success, or of sheltering himself afterwards from all reproach, James at first essayed to govern legally. The very day on which he ascended the throne, he promised to maintain the laws established in church and state. He soon after assembled a parliament, and to it solemnly renewed his promises. Some important though

isolated facts soon belied them. He continued to levy taxes which parliament had not voted. At the very time when, to please the Anglican church, he redoubled the severities against the dissenters, he began to suspend the laws against the catholics, and to aim serious blows at the political and religious government of the state.

His language was still more alarming than his actions. All the time protesting the legality of his intentions, he indirectly asserted his right to absolute power, and his resolution to make use of it, unless the country appreciated his moderation, and was content with what he chose to concede.

It is the pretension now of kings, now of the people—the former in the name of divine right, the latter in that of popular sovereignty—to intimidate each other by indicating beforehand the deadly blows they can strike: a pretension as senseless as insolent, which enervates and shakes, now the government, now the liberties of the country. It behoves alike kings and peoples, in their mutual relations, to advance only their legal rights, and to bury in profound silence the mysteries and the menaces of *coups d'état* and revolutions.

The promises of James, and his essays at legal government were received by the country with favour, almost with enthusiasm. The more vivid the fears of men, the more earnest are their hopes. The tories ruled in parliament. The Anglican church strove to bind the king to the engagements he had made with her, by showing herself more and more monarchical and devoted. The dissenters saw glimpses of toleration and liberty. Good and evil tendencies, honourable and dishonourable views, concurred to insure to the king the patient and almost servile submission of the country. At court and in parliament, the majority of the leading men, corrupt sceptics, were ready, beyond all precedent, to sacrifice their opinions and their honour to their fortune. In the nation, a profound feeling of lassitude combined with the monarchical spirit and with religious discipline to repress the explosion of discontent and alarm. James was no longer young; his daughters, sole heirs to the throne, were devoted to the protestant faith; it was better for a short time to endure evils, the term of which was certain, than to risk new revolutions.

Ardent faction, professional conspiracies, despairing ambition, the exiles who had taken refuge in Holland, were

not so resigned or so patient. Despite the counsels of the Prince of Orange, who protected, and at the same time sought to restrain them, they attempted two simultaneous risings in Scotland and in England, under the direction of Lord Argyle and of the Duke of Monmouth. The people were aroused by them; a marked sympathy for the insurgents spread rapidly through the popular classes, but it did not break out. The whig party did not support the rebellion; the tory party powerfully aided the king to repress it. Both attempts failed; the two leaders lost their heads on the scaffold; their fate excited public compassion; neither their personal characters nor their views responded to the national sentiment.

But the appearance of success is fatal to weak princes engaged in a struggle with their people. James, victorious over his enemies, and obeyed by his subjects, abandoned himself to the vices of his nature. He took pleasure in the harsh, nay, in the cruel exercise of power, and found in Jeffreys a daring and malignant minister of his vengeance. The judicial rigours exercised against the partisans of Argyle and of Monmouth, with a gross contempt of legal guarantees and of human feelings, excited in the public mind, high and low, friends or enemies of revolt, profound indignation and deep disgust. Concurrently with this, James gave full play to his designs; he attacked at once the Anglican church in her vital rights, and the most faithful of his own protestant servants in the deepest recesses of their conscience. The Universities of Oxford and Cambridge were ordered to nominate catholic heads to protestant establishments. Rochester received from the mouth of the king the intimation, that if he did not become a catholic, he should lose all his offices. Even by the catholic party itself, menaces, so evidently illegal and extreme, were combated. Two coteries—the one, honest and prudent, the other, intriguing and rash—contended for the king's favour, and daily pointed out to him, to restrain or to excite him, the one, the peril into which he was precipitating himself, the other, the aims to which he aspired. Nothing was wanting to enlighten James; neither the loyalty and long patience of the protestants, nor the moderation and wise counsels of the catholics themselves. All was wrecked on his blind, though sincere, obstinacy. He officially summoned to his council a Jesuit, Father Petre, and ordered the

Anglican clergy to read from all the pulpits of the kingdom the declaration by which, in virtue of his sole power, he definitively abolished the statutes passed by parliament against dissenters and catholics. The Archbishop of Canterbury and six bishops refused to execute this order, and presented a petition to the king against it. He had them arrested, taken to the Tower, and prosecuted in the Court of King's Bench for a seditious libel.

At the same time, contrary to the expectation, and to the great suspicion—unfounded, but natural, of all England, a son was born to James. The dominant coterie gave loud expression to their joy, promising themselves to train up and to rule the son as they had ruled the father; and the new regime, hitherto tolerated by reason of its approaching close, assumed the form of an endless perspective.

No disorder broke out; the country remained motionless; but the heads of the country changed their resolution. Driven to extremity, the Anglican church adopted passive resistance; the political parties took a more decisive step—whigs and tories alike. Experience had shown the whigs that alone they could neither rally the nation nor found a government; their conspiracies had failed, like their cabinets; they had the rare wisdom to recognise that they themselves did not suffice for their designs, and that their close union with their old adversaries could alone ensure them success. The tories, on their part, saw that every principle has its limits—every engagement its conditions—every duty its reciprocity. For forty years they had asserted the maxim of non-resistance to the crown, and maintained a scrupulous fidelity towards their kings. Called to a new trial, they felt that their country also had a right to their fidelity, and that they were not bound, merely for the sake of consistency in language, servilely to deliver up to a senseless prince their liberties and their faith. Glorious names—men high in both parties—Russell, Sydney, and Cavendish; Danby, Shrewsbury, and Lumley—concerted and united. Sounded by them, Halifax, the chief of the moderate party, declined any active part in their plans, but attempted no dissuasion. And on the 30th of June, 1688, at the moment when the solemn acquittal of the seven bishops filled London with impassioned acclamations, Admiral Herbert, disguised as a sailor, departed for Holland, conveying to the Prince of

Orange, on the part, and under the signature, of these six chiefs of the two parties, and of Compton, bishop of London, a formal invitation to come to the succour of the faith and laws of England, and their engagement to sustain him at all risks, and with all their power.

William had only awaited for this step. "Now or never," said he to his confidant, Dykenveldt, when he heard of the trial of the bishops, and of their resistance. So soon as he received the message, with an able and daring mixture of frankness and caution, he publicly announced and prepared for his design. He was not going, he said, to make a conquest and usurp a crown; he was going, at the request of the English themselves, to mediate between them and their king, to protect the menaced laws of England, and the protestant faith. He discussed the propriety of the enterprise with the States-general of Holland, demanding their assent and support. He notified the matter, not only to the protestant princes, but also to the Emperor of Germany and to the King of Spain, in the character with the former, of defender of protestantism; with the others, of maintaining the balance of power in Europe. Never was such an enterprise so avowed, discussed, explained, justified, before-hand. All Europe saw, and comprehended. Conspiracy, and personal ambition disappeared in the grandeur of the cause and of the event. And, less than four months after the arrival of the whig and tory message, William set sail for England, at the head of a fleet and army; bearing with him the secret adhesion and good wishes of the majority of the kings, protestant and catholic, and of Pope Innocent XI. himself, whom the haughty conduct of Louis XIV. had inspired with profound resentment, and the insane temerity of James with profound contempt.

James alone comprehended and believed nothing. In vain did he receive from Louis XIV. precise information, and offers of effective succours. In vain did his own agents at the Hague and at Paris, give him an account of the preparations and progress of the undertaking. He rejected all offers and all information. From a remnant of English and kingly pride, he did not choose to be publicly supported by the soldiers of the foreign king, from whom he had secretly accepted gifts without a blush. From the very fear concealed in the depth of his soul, it was in the presentiment of his

powerlessness, that he rejected the idea of his danger. This presentiment did not deceive him. More than six weeks elapsed between the disembarkation of William and his triumph at London. He slowly advanced across the country, equally ready for adhesion and for resistance. Resistance nowhere manifested itself; not an effort was made, not a drop of blood was shed in defence of James. As prostrate in peril, as of late obstinate in not foreseeing it, he attempted to regain by his weakness that which he had lost by his temerity: he retracted all he had done, granted all he had refused, restored to the towns their charters, to the universities their privileges, to the bishops his favour, dismissed Father Petre from his councils, and sought to negotiate with William. Weakness was as futile as temerity had been powerless.

James, shut up in his palace, heard every day of some new defection of his generals and councillors. His daughter, the Princess Anne, escaped and repaired to the head-quarters of the prince. Whitehall became a solitude, and menaced soon to become a prison. James himself fled in his turn. Recognised in his flight, and brought back to London by a vulgar crowd, after some days more of unavailing perplexities, he fled again, never to return. On the 18th of December, 1688, he had scarcely quitted London three hours, when six English and Scottish regiments entered it, with flying banners, in the name of the Prince of Orange. William himself, avoiding, as much from taste as from calculation, all appearance of triumph, arrived in the evening at the palace of St. James's; and five weeks afterwards, January 22nd, 1689, a parliament, extraordinarily assembled under the name of Convention, met at Westminster, to consecrate and to regulate the revolution.

In it broke out between the various parties, and in the heart of each respectively, those dissensions which the common danger had till then restrained. With the tories, all the monarchical scruples were aroused. Among the whigs, all the revolutionary temptations re-appeared. The more timid of the tories said it would be wise to recal James, merely obtaining from him some guarantees. The more violent of the whigs talked of founding a republic, directed by a council of state, of which the Prince of Orange should be President. Between these extreme opinions floated the moderate opinions, equally various and agitated. Many whigs, monarchical by

disposition, and still imbued with the maxims of the republican long parliament, wished that James should be formally deposed, and the crown be only offered to William after they had, by sovereign laws, organized the republic in the monarchy. On their part, the tories, devoted to the church, demanded that, in declaring James incapable of governing, the foundation of the monarchy should be respected, and that they should confine themselves to the establishment of a regency. Others, more daring but subtilely scrupulous in their monarchical principles, admitted, with the whigs, that James, by his conduct and his flight, had abdicated the government; but they maintained that, by this sole fact, the throne, which could not be vacant one single day, belonged of right to his eldest daughter, the Princess Mary, and that all that was required was formally to proclaim her queen. As these various plans were brought forward, they were expounded, contested, and discussed with ardour, both in and out of parliament; men's minds grew excited; the parties developed themselves more distinctly; the ambitious unfurled the banner under which they hoped to rise; division sprang up between the Lords and Commons. The revolution, scarcely accomplished, was already in danger.

But the same profound political acumen which had united the chiefs of the parties in resistances, guided them in the first steps of government. They set aside all absolute theories—all practically futile questions—reduced the conditions and principles on which the new power was to be founded to what was strictly necessary to give it a powerful basis, and were only anxious to arrive at a speedy conclusion, and to rally round that conclusion the great interests of the country. William aided the wisdom of the leaders, first by his reserve, and next by his firmness. He gave free play to all systems—to all projects—testifying neither displeasure at opposition, nor desire of success, and keeping apart from every discussion on the subject. But when he felt that the crisis approached, he assembled the leading men of both houses, and declared to them, in simple terms, brief but unanswerable, that he had the highest respect for the right and the liberty of parliament, but that he also had his own liberty and right, and would never accept mutilated power—a throne where his wife should sit above him. The step was decisive. The

two houses came to an understanding; a declaration was adopted, proclaiming at once the fact of the vacancy of the throne, the essential rights of the English people, and the elevation of William and Mary, Prince and Princess of Orange, to the throne of England. And on the 13th of February, 1689, in the principal quarters of London, the public received the official proclamation of the act of parliament with acclamation.

It is the safety of nations, in the crises of their destiny, to comprehend and to practise, alternately by submission and by action, the counsels which God has given them in the events of their life. England had learned by her first trials that a revolution is, in itself, an immense, inscrutable disorder, inflicting on society great evils, great perils, great crimes, and that a rational people may some day be constrained to accept it, but that it should dread and delay it till the very hour of absolute necessity arrives. England remembered this in her new trials. She endured much, she resisted long, in order to escape from a new revolution, and she only submitted to it in the last extremity, when she saw no other mode of saving her faith, her rights, and her honour. It is the glory of the revolution of 1688 that it was an act of pure defence, and of necessary defence; that was the primary cause of its success.

Defensive in its principle, this revolution was, at the same time, precise and limited in its object. In the great convulsions of society, a fever of universal ambition, sovereign, impious, sometimes seizes upon men; they imagine in themselves the right and the power to lay hands upon all things, and to reform the world as to them seems fit. Nothing is more absurd, more vain, than these vague extravagancies of the human creature, who, treating as chaos the grand system in the bosom of which his place is marked out, essays to erect himself into a creator, and only succeeds in communicating the disorder of his own dreams to whatever he approaches.

England in 1688, did not fall into this frenzy; she did not aspire to change the basis of society and the destinies of humanity; she asserted and maintained a positive faith, positive laws, positive rights, within which she limited her aims and her thoughts; she accomplished a revolution at one

lofty and unassuming, which gave to the country new chiefs and new guarantees; and which, this object attained, remained content, admitting nothing less, and seeking nothing more.

This revolution was accomplished, not by popular insurrection, but by organized popular parties; organized long before the revolution, with a view to regular government, not in a revolutionary spirit. Neither the tory party, nor the whig party itself, notwithstanding the revolutionary elements that entered into its composition, had been framed to overturn established order. They were parties of legal politics, not of conspiracy and insurrection. They were led by circumstances to change the government of the country; they were not created for this design, and they resumed order, without an effort, after quitting its limits for a moment, not from habit or from taste, but from necessity.

And it was not one of the great parties, so long opposed, that had alone the merit and the burden of the revolution; they united together and concerted to accomplish it. It was with them a work of concession, of mutual arrangement, under a common necessity; not a victory or a defeat. Whigs and tories saw it approach, and received it with different feelings; all welcomed and took part in it.

It has often been said in France, and even in England, that the revolution of 1688 was a work essentially aristocratic, and not popular; accomplished by the combinations and for the benefit of the upper classes; not by the impulsive energy of and for the benefit of the people.

This is a remarkable example, among many others, of the confusion of ideas and the oblivion of facts, which so often regulate the appreciation of great events.

The revolution of 1688 accomplished, in political order, the two most popular things known to history: it proclaimed and guaranteed, on the one hand, the personal and universal rights of individual citizens; on the other, the active and decisive participation of the country in its government. Every democracy which does not know that this is all it needs and ought to claim, is ignorant of its greatest interests, and will never be able to form a government, or to guard its own liberties.

In moral order, the revolution of 1688 had a still more popular character; it was effected in the name and by the power

of the religious belief of the people, for their security and their sway. In no other country, and at no epoch, has the faith of the masses exercised more empire over the fate of their government.

Popular in its principles, and in its results, the revolution of 1688 was aristocratic in the execution; it was conceived, prepared, and perfected by great men, faithful representatives of the interests and sentiments of the nation. England has had this rare good fortune, that powerful and close bonds of union have been established and perpetuated between the different classes of her society. Her aristocracy and her democracy have had the wisdom to live and prosper together, amicably sustaining and checking each other. Her leaders have not isolated themselves from the people, and the people have not been left without leaders. It was especially in 1688 that the English nation reaped the fruits of this happy combination of hierarchy and harmony in the social order. To save its faith, its laws, its liberties, it was forced to the formidable necessity of a revolution; it accomplished it through men of order and government, not through revolutionists. The same influences which essayed the work, were also those which restrained it within just limits, and undertook to establish it, the cause of the English people, triumphing by the hands of the aristocracy. Such was the grand characteristics of the revolution of 1688, and, from its outset, the pledge of its future fortune.

All this union and power was in no degree beyond the requirements of the occasion, for such is the innate vice of all revolutions, that even the most necessary, the most legitimate, the most powerful of them, throws the society it serves into great disorder, and itself long remains after menaced and precarious. Two or three years had scarcely elapsed; already the sovereign of England, king William, had become intensely unpopular. His manners at once plain and proud, his cold silence, his distaste, which he took little pains to hide, for the manners of the English aristocracy, his intimacy reserved for, and his favours lavished upon old Dutch friends,—everything about him contributed to render him a stranger among and unpopular with his new people. He was, in matters of civil and religious liberty, far more enlightened than the English, and little inclined

to become the instrument of the rigour of episcopal intolerance, and of the animosities of aristocratic party spirit. He had slight regard for the exigencies of the constitutional regime, did not understand the game of the parliamentary parties, still confused and scarcely formed,—was shocked at their selfishness, jealous of their influence, and defended his own power against them at times with more vigour than discretion. In his government, as in his thoughts, the general policy of Europe was his grand, almost his sole business. It was more especially to put in operation the whole force of England, in his struggle against the European domination of Louis XIV., that he had aspired to her throne; the protestant passions of the English people accorded with his designs. But William compromised England in the combinations and wars of the continent, more than suited the habits, tastes, and interests of the nation. It became weary of seeing itself more and more deeply engaged in remote efforts and perils, by the very prince whom it had summoned to deliver it from internal dangers; and William, on his part, was indignant to find, in the people and in the parties whom he had delivered on their own soil, so little devotion for the great cause on which, in his opinion, their safety and liberty so intimately depended. Hence arose, between the king and the parliament, misunderstanding, rancour, conflicts, which troubled and shook the new government. William knew his power, and used it haughtily: he went so far as to say, that he might chance to abdicate and withdraw to Holland, if he was not better understood and supported. When the danger became pressing, parliament, parties, church, and people, felt how necessary William was to them, and once more hailed him with the most cordial professions of attachment. But mutual discord soon revived; parties returned to their rivalries, the people to their ignorant prejudices, the king to his European policy, his war demands, and his susceptibilities of power. The Jacobites had resumed hope: beaten in Ireland and Scotland, discovered and condemned in England, they none the less renewed their essays at civil war and conspiracy. Even in William's council, King James had correspondents, who worked as best they might the chances that still remained to him. During the whole course of this reign, notwithstanding

the facile success of the revolution, the firm genius of the king, and the sincere adhesion of the country, the establishment of 1688 was incessantly assailed and tottering.

The same evil subsisted under Queen Anne. The whigs and tories, more and more disunited, fiercely contested for power. In the European struggle for the Spanish succession, the two parties, at first, alike pursued the policy of King William as to intervention and continental war. Misled by the easy course of routine, and by success, the whigs desired to carry the war beyond its limits, or the necessity of the case. The tories took in hand the cause of peace. They represented in this the feeling of England, and the Queen favoured them. By the treaty of Utrecht they removed the precarious tension which had agitated Europe. The tories were all but Jacobites; despite her protestant fidelity, family sentiment awoke in the heart of Queen Anne; internal intrigues, became mingled with external complications; the banished Stuarts seemed again to have a chance; the establishment of 1688 seemed again to become a question. The death of Anne, however, and the peaceful accession of the House of Hanover, confirmed it. Under the reigns of George I. and George II., men's minds took another course: foreign policy ceased to be their principal affair; the internal administration, the maintenance of peace, finance, the colonies, commerce, the development and contests of parliamentary rule, became the engrossing objects of attention, both with the government and with the public. Yet the question of revolution and of dynasty was not extinct: the English nation felt no affection for German kings who did not speak their language, who were uncomfortable amongst them, who eagerly seized every pretext to absent themselves, and live for a while in their own petty state abroad, and incessantly involved them in their continental affairs, to England wholly unimportant and uninteresting. The domestic quarrels of the royal family, the coarsely licentious manners of the court, were offensive to the country; the constant change of ministers, the selfish rivalry, the factitious passions, the exaggerations and the intrigues of parliamentary parties, shocked its honesty and its common sense. In Scotland, in Ireland, even in England, Jacobite conspiracies and insurrections pertinaciously sprung up, one after another, always suppressed, but always finding earnest adherents, and no longer exciting in

the country any excitement of fear or antipathy. Amid these continual attacks upon established order, indifference, listlessness, a humour of critical questioning, disaffection, became the prevalent tendency; the public seemed to withdraw from a power which it had ceased to like or be anxious about. Fifty-seven years after the national impulse which had elevated William III. to the throne, the grandson of James II., at the head of the Scotch Highlanders, penetrated, without resistance, to the very centre of England; and already men, everywhere, asked one another, whether he would not enter London in a few days, as easily as William entered it, after driving away his grandfather.

But England and her government were not at the mercy of a fever of popular humour, or of the defeat of two or three regiments, or of the bold stroke of a faction. The same social force, which in 1688 had made the Revolution, defended and saved, in 1745, the establishment it had founded. When the peril became evident, the enemies of that establishment encountered the strong organization of the aristocratic parties, the good sense of a disciplined democracy, and the faith of a Christian people. The whig leaders, and many of those of the tories, regarded their honour and political fortune as bound to this cause. The parties were faithful to their leaders: the middle classes forgot their discontents, their displeasures, and the little personal sympathy with which the government inspired them, in order to occupy themselves only with the essential interests of the country and their own. Churchmen and dissenters showed themselves animated by the same devotion. Before this intelligent union of the aristocracy and people, of political with religious spirit, the success of the Jacobites faded away as rapidly as it had burst forth. The greatest danger which the English monarchy had encountered was also the last. From this epoch a few secret plans, a few attempts, abortive as soon as conceived, faintly revealed the existence of its enemies. Seventy years of laborious and painful trials had to elapse before the establishment of 1688 could overcome the vices natural to every revolution, restore peace to society, and become an undisputed rule. In 1760, when George III. mounted the throne, the work was already accomplished; I have said by what means, and at what price.

George III. had reigned sixteen years, when, at a distance

of three thousand miles from his capital, more than two millions of his subjects broke the bonds which united them to his throne, proclaimed their independence, and undertook to found the United States of America. A struggle of seven years sufficed to make England recognise this independence, and treat on equal terms with the new State. Since that, seventy-seven years have elapsed, and without effort, without extraordinary events, solely by the development of their institutions and of a pacific spirit of policy, the United States have gloriously taken their place among the great nations. Never was rapid greatness so cheaply bought at its commencement, and so little troubled in its progress.

The United States of America are not indebted for this rare good fortune solely to their distance from all powerful rivals, and to the immense space open before them. Causes less fortuitous, and more moral, have also contributed to the rapid growth and serenity of their greatness.

They entered on life under the banner of justice and right. With them, too, the revolution, with which their history began, was at first an act of defence. They claimed the guarantees and principles set down in their charter, and which the parliament of England, who refused them these, had itself anciently claimed and made triumphant in the mother country, with much more violence and disorder than their resistance brought with it.

They did not, truly speaking, attempt a revolution. Their enterprise was, without doubt, great and perilous. To effect their independence, they undertook to make war against a powerful enemy, and to found a central government to replace the distant power whose yoke they had thrown off. But in their local and ordinary institutions, they had no revolutions to make; each colony was already governed freely in its interior, and found, on becoming a state, but few changes to make in the maxims and organization of the public power. There was no old social order to fear, to detest, and to destroy; attachment to the laws and ancient customs, affectionate respect for the past, were, on the contrary, the general feeling. The colonial government, under the patronage of a distant monarchy, was transformed without effort into a system under the bond of a federal government.

Of all systems of government, the republican is most cer-

tainly that for which the general and spontaneous assent of the country is the most necessary. We can imagine, and we have seen monarchical states founded by force, but a republic imposed upon a nation, a popular government established against the instincts and the wish of the people, is repugnant to good sense and right. The English colonies of America had not, in order to become a republic, such a difficulty to surmount. They were republicans quite voluntarily; in adopting the republican government, they only fulfilled the wishes of the nation, and developed, instead of abolishing, their ancient system of rule.

Social order was not more deranged than political order. There was no struggle between the different classes, no violent displacement of influences. Although the crown of England retained partisans in the colonies, the same spirit, the same design, ruled in all grades of the social scale. The rich and influential families themselves were in general the most firmly resolved on the conquest of independence, and the founding of a new government; the people advanced, and the event was accomplished under their direction.

Nor was there any greater revolution in mind than in society. The philosophical ideas of the eighteenth century, its moral scepticism, its religious incredulity, doubtless penetrated and circulated in the United States; but they did not completely invade the minds they came in contact with; they did not fix themselves there with their fundamental principles, and their final consequences. The moral gravity and practical good sense of the old puritans still endured among the greater part of the American admirers of the French philosophers, and the bulk of the American population remained profoundly Christian; as much attached to its dogmas as to its liberties, submissive to God and to the Bible, at the same time that it rose against the parliament and the King of England, and governed, while struggling for its independence, by the same faith which had led its ancestors into that land, there to lay the foundations on which arose the new state.

The ideas and passions which now-a-days, in the name of democracy, hurry away and disorganize society, are spread abroad and powerful in the United States of America; there they ferment with all the contagious errors and dangerous vices they contain. But hitherto they have been efficaciously

restrained and purified by the Christian faith, by the excellent political traditions, and strong legal habits, which govern the population. At the same time that the principles of anarchy audaciously display themselves on this vast theatre, the principles of order and conservatism exist there solid and energetic, in society and in man himself. We everywhere recognise their presence and influence, in the very bosom of the party which qualifies itself with the name of democratic *par excellence*; they temper and regulate it, and often, unknown to it, save it from its own passionate precipitation. These are the tutelary principles which presided at the origin of the American revolution, and which have given it success. May Heaven grant that in the fearful struggle they have in our day everywhere to sustain, they may continue to prevail among this powerful people, and may ever turn it in time from the abysses which are so near it!

Three great men, Cromwell, Washington, and William III., remain in history as the chiefs and representatives of those sovereign crises which have decided the destiny of two great nations. In extent and energy of natural talent, Cromwell is perhaps the most eminent of the three. He possessed a mind of wonderful activity, prompt, firm, just, supple, inventive, and a vigour of character which no obstacle could repel, no struggle tire; which pursued its designs with an ardour and patience equally inexhaustible, alternately by steps the most tortuous and slow, the most abrupt and bold. He excelled equally in gaining and in ruling men in his personal and intimate relations; in organizing or in conducting an army or a party. He had the instinct of popularity and the gift of authority, and could, with equal boldness, unchain or bind faction. But born in the bosom of revolution, and carried by shock after shock to the supreme power, his genius was, and remained, essentially revolutionary. He had learned the necessities of order and government; he could neither respect nor practise moral and permanent laws. It may have been the fault of his nature or his position; but he wanted steadiness and serenity in the exercise of power, resorted, on the instant, to extreme measures, as a man, perpetually assailed by mortal perils, and by the violence of his remedies, perpetuated or aggravated the violent evils he wished to cure. The formation of a government is a task which demands more regular proceedings, more

conformable with the eternal laws of moral order. Cromwell could master the revolution he had made, but could not establish it. Less gifted naturally perhaps, William III. and Washington succeeded in the undertaking where Cromwell had failed. They decided the destiny and founded the government of their country; and this was from their never, even in the midst of revolution, admitting or practising a revolutionary policy; they never accepted the fatal situation of first anarchical acts of violence for a footstool, and then despotic violence as a necessity of power. They found, or placed themselves, from the very beginning, in the regular path and permanent condition of government.

William was an ambitious prince. It is childish to believe that, till the call was addressed to him from London in 1688, he had been a stranger to any desire to ascend the throne of England,—to the labour, long in process, to convey him the throne. William, step by step, followed the progress of this labour, without being an accomplice in it, but without rejecting its aim—not encouraging it, but protecting its authors. His ambition had, at the same time, this character, that it clung to the triumph of a great and just cause—the cause of religious liberty, and the balance of power in Europe. Never did man make more than William a great political design the thought and sole object of his life. He had a passion for the task he accomplished, and his own greatness was to him only a means. In his views on the crown of England he did not attempt to succeed by violence and disorder; his spirit was too elevated and well balanced not to know the incurable vices of such success, or to take their yoke; but, when the career was opened to him by England herself, he did not suffer private scruples to stop him. He wished his cause to triumph, and to receive the honour of triumph. A glorious combination of ability and faith, of ambition and devotion. Washington had no ambition. His country had need of him; he became great to serve her, from duty rather than from taste, and at times by a painful effort. The trials of public life were bitter to him; he preferred the independence of private life and repose of mind, to the exercise of power; but he accepted, without hesitation, the task which his country imposed on him; and, in accomplishing it, he did not allow himself or his country any indulgence even

to lighten its burthen. Born to govern, although he took little pleasure in it, he told the American people what he believed to be true, and maintained, while governing them, what he believed to be wise, with a firmness as unshakeable as it was simple, and a sacrifice of popularity, the more meritorious because he was not recompensed for it by the joys of ruling. The servant of a growing republic, where the democratic spirit prevailed, he obtained its confidence and ensured its triumph, by sustaining its interests against its inclinations, and by practising that policy, at once modest and severe, reserved and independent, which only seems to belong to the leader of an aristocratic senate, placed at the head of an ancient state. Rare success, equally an honour to Washington and to his country.

Whether we look at the destiny of nations, or at that of great men—whether a monarchy or a republic is in question—an aristocratic or a democratic society—the same truth is revealed by facts; definitive success is only obtained by the same principles and in the same way. The revolutionary spirit is fatal to the greatness it raises up, as to that which it overturns. The policy which preserves states is also that alone which terminates and founds revolutions.

HISTORY OF THE ENGLISH REVOLUTION.

FROM THE
ACCESSION OF CHARLES I. TO HIS DEATH.

BOOK THE FIRST.

1625—1629.

Accession of Charles the First to the throne—State and disposition of England—Meeting of the first parliament—Spirit of liberty manifested therein—Its dissolution—First attempts at arbitrary government—Their bad success—Second parliament—Impeachment of the Duke of Buckingham—Dissolution of parliament—Ill administration of Buckingham—Third parliament—Petition of rights—Prorogation of parliament—Murder of Buckingham—Second session of the third parliament—Fresh causes of public discontent—The king's displeasure—dissolution of the third parliament.

ON the 27th of March, 1625, Charles the First ascended the throne, and immediately afterwards (2nd April) convoked a parliament. Scarcely was the house of commons assembled, (18th June,) when a worthy man, who had been reckoned in the last reign among the opponents of the court, Sir Benjamin Rudyard, rose (22nd June) and moved that henceforth nothing should be neglected to maintain a perfect harmony between the king and the people: "For," said he, "what may we expect from him, being king; his good natural disposition, his freedom from vice, his travels abroad, his being bred in parliament, promise greatly."¹

All England, indeed, gave way to joy and hope. And it was not merely those vague hopes, those tumultuous rejoicings, which a new reign, as a matter of course, gives rise to;

¹ Parl. Hist. vol. ii. col. 5.

they were serious, general, and seemingly well founded. Charles was a prince of grave and pure conduct, of acknowledged piety, diligent, learned, frugal, little inclined to prodigality, reserved without moroseness, dignified without arrogance. He maintained decorum and order in his household; everything about him announced a noble, upright character, the friend of justice: his manners and deportment awed his courtiers, and pleased the people; his virtues had gained him the esteem of all good men. Weary of the mean ways, the talkative and familiar pedantry, the inert and pusillanimous policy of James, England promised herself happiness and liberty under a king whom she could respect.

Charles and the English nation did not know to what a degree they were already antagonistic one to the other, nor the causes which, long since at work, and growing each day more powerful, would soon prevent the possibility of their understanding and agreeing with each other.

Two revolutions, the one visible and even glaring, the other internal, unperceived, but not the less certain, were being accomplished at this epoch; the first, in the kingly power of Europe; the second, in the social state and manners of the English people.

It was just at this time, that, on the continent, royalty, freed from its ancient trammels, was becoming everywhere well nigh absolute. In France, in Spain, in most of the states of the German empire, it had quelled the feudal aristocracy, and was ceasing to protect the liberty of the commons, having no longer need of them to oppose to other enemies. The higher nobility, as if it had lost even the feeling of its defeat, crowded around the throne, almost proud of the brilliant display of its conquerors. The burghers, dispersed, and of a timid nature, rejoicing in the order now beginning to prevail, productive of a happiness till then unknown to them, laboured to enrich and enlighten themselves, without aspiring as yet to any place in the government of the state. Everywhere, the pomp of courts, the dispatch of administrative business, the extent and regularity of wars, proclaimed the preponderance of royal power. The maxims of divine right and passive obedience prevailed, feebly contested even where not recognised. In a word, the progress of civilization, of letters, and arts, of internal peace

and prosperity, embellishing this triumph of pure monarchy, inspired princes with a presumptuous confidence, and people with admiring compliance.

Royalty in England had not remained an exception to this European movement. From the accession of the house of Tudor, in 1485, it had ceased to have as adversaries those proud barons, who, too weak to struggle individually against their king, had formerly, by coalescing together, been able now to maintain their own rights, at other times to associate themselves, by main force, in the exercise of royal power. Broken up, impoverished, reduced by its own excesses, above all by the wars of the two Roses, this aristocracy, so long unmanageable, yielded, almost without resistance, first to the haughty tyranny of Henry VIII., and afterwards to the skilful policy of Elizabeth. Become the head of the church, and the possessor of immense estates, Henry, by distributing these with lavish hand among families whose greatness he himself thus created, or whose fallen fortunes he thus restored, began the metamorphosis of barons into courtiers. Under Elizabeth this metamorphosis was completed. A woman and a queen, a brilliant court at once gratified her taste and her sense of power, and augmented that power; the nobility thronged thither with delight, and without too much exciting public discontent. It was a rare temptation thus to devote themselves to a popular sovereign, and to seek by intrigues, and amid constant festivities, the favour of a queen who enjoyed that of the country.

The maxims, the forms, and the language, often even the practices of pure monarchy, were forgiven in a government useful and glorious to the nation; the affection of the people kept full pace with the servility of the courtiers; and towards a woman, all whose perils were public perils, unbounded devotion seemed a law to the gentleman, a duty to the protestant and citizen.

The Stuarts could not fail to advance in the path which, since the accession of the Tudors, English royalty had entered upon. A Scotchman, and of the blood of Guise, James I., by his family reminiscences and the habits of his country, was attached to France, and accustomed to seek his allies and his models on the continent, where, ordinarily, an English prince

only saw enemies: accordingly, he soon showed himself still more profoundly imbued than Elizabeth and even than Henry VIII. himself, with the maxims which, at that time, were in Europe the basis of pure monarchy; he professed them with the pride of a theologian and the complacency of a king, protesting on every occasion, by the pomp of his declarations, against the timidity of his acts and the limits of his power. Compelled, sometimes, to defend, by more direct and simpler arguments, the measures of his government, arbitrary imprisonments or illegal taxes, James at such times alleged the example of the king of France or of Spain. "The king of England," said his ministers to the house of commons, "must not be worse off than his equals." And such, even in England, was the influence of the revolution lately accomplished in continental monarchy, that the adversaries of the court were embarrassed by this language, almost convinced themselves that the inherent dignity of princes required that all should enjoy the same rights, and at a loss how to reconcile this necessary equality among kings with the liberties of their country.¹

Nurtured from his infancy in these pretensions and these maxims, prince Charles, upon arriving at manhood, was still nearer exposed to their contagion. The infanta of Spain was promised to him: the duke of Buckingham suggested to him the idea of going secretly to Madrid to sue in person for her heart and hand. So romantic a design pleased the young man's imagination. The next thing was to obtain the king's consent. James refused, flew into a passion, wept, and at last yielded to his favourite rather than to his son.² Charles was received at Madrid with great honours, (March, 1623,) and there saw, in all its splendour, monarchy majestic, supreme, receiving, from its immediate servants a devotion, and from the people a respect, almost religious; rarely contradicted, and even then always sure of ultimately getting the better of all opposition, by its mere will. The match with the infanta was broken off; so Charles married, instead of her, Henrietta-Maria, princess of France;³ for his father had made up his mind, that beyond those two courts there was no alli-

¹ Journals of the Commons, 1614.

² Clarendon's History of the Rebellion, (1708,) i. 18.

³ The marriage negotiated in 1624 was not definitively concluded till May, 1625; it took place in England the next month.

ance suitable to the dignity of his throne. The influence of this union on the English prince was precisely the same which he had felt in Spain; and the monarchy of Paris or Madrid became in his eyes the very image of the natural and legitimate condition of a king.

Thus English monarchy, at least in the monarch, his counsellors, and his court, followed the same direction as the monarchies of the continent. Here, also, everything manifested the symptoms and effects of the revolution already accomplished elsewhere, and which, in its most moderate pretensions, only allowed the liberties of subjects to exist as subordinate rights, as concessions by the sovereign's generosity.

But while on the continent this revolution found the people as yet incapable of resisting it, perhaps even disposed to receive it, in England a counter-revolution, secretly at work in society, had already mined away the ground under the feet of pure monarchy, and prepared its ruin amid its fancied progress.

When, on the accession of the Tudors, the high aristocracy bowed and humbled itself before the throne, the English commons were not in a position to take its place in the struggle of liberty against power; they would not even have dared to aspire to the honour of the contest. In the fourteenth century, at the time of their most rapid progress, their ambition was limited to the obtaining a recognition of their most simple and primitive rights, to the achieving a few incomplete and precarious guarantees. Never had their fancy soared so high as to give them the notion that they had any right, that they were called upon to take a share in the sovereignty, to participate in a permanent and positive manner in the government of the country; the barons alone, they thought, were fitted for so high a purpose.

In the sixteenth century, harassed and ruined, like the barons, by the civil wars, the commons needed above all things order and repose; this royalty gave them, imperfectly indeed, but still more secure and better regulated than they had ever known it before. They accepted the benefit with earnest gratitude. Separated from their ancient leaders, standing well nigh alone in presence of the throne and of those barons who once were their allies, their language was

humble, their conduct timid, and the king might well have believed that thenceforward the people would be as docile as the great nobles.

But the people was not in England, as on the continent, an ill-combined coalition of citizens and peasants, whose emancipation from their ancient servitude had proceeded by very slow degrees, and who were not yet quite free from the yoke. The English house of commons had, as early as the fourteenth century, received within its walls the most numerous class of the English aristocracy, all the proprietors of small fiefs, who had not sufficient influence or wealth to share with the barons the sovereign power, but were proud of the same origin, and had long possessed the same rights. Become the leaders of the nation, these men had more than once communicated to it a strength, and, above all, a boldness, of which the commonalty alone would have been incapable. Weakened and depressed, in common with the lower orders, by the long miseries of civil discord, they soon, in the bosom of peace, resumed their importance and their pride. While the higher nobility, flocking to court to repair their losses, were invested with factitious greatness, as corrupting as precarious, and which, without giving them back their former fortunes, separated them more and more from the people; the gentry, the freeholders, the citizens, solely occupied in improving their lands or their commercial capital, were increasing in riches and credit, were becoming daily more closely united, were drawing the entire people under their influence; and, without show, without political design, almost unconsciously to themselves, were taking possession of all the social strength, the true source of power.

In the towns, commerce and industry were rapidly developing themselves: the city of London had already acquired immense wealth; the king, the court, nearly all the great nobles of the kingdom, became its debtors, as necessitous as insolent. The mercantile marine, that nursery of the royal navy, was numerous, and active in every quarter, and the sailors seemed imbued with all the earnestness of their employers.

In the country, things followed the same course. Property was more and more divided out. The feudal laws opposed obstacles to the sale and subdivision of fiefs: a statute of

Henry VII. to a great extent removed these obstacles indirectly; the high nobility received this as a favour, and hastened to profit by it. They, in like manner, alienated most of the vast domains that Henry VIII. had distributed among them.¹ The king favoured these sales in order to augment the number of possessors of ecclesiastical property, and the courtiers were fain to have recourse to them, for all the abuses within their reach did not suffice for their necessities. By and by, Elizabeth, to avoid asking for subsidies, always burdensome even to the power that obtains them, sold a large extent of the crown lands. Nearly all these were bought by gentlemen who lived on their estates, by freeholders who cultivated theirs, or by citizens retiring from trade, for they alone had acquired by their industry or economy the means of paying for that which the prince and the courtiers could not keep. Agriculture was prospering, the counties and towns were becoming filled with a rich, active, and independent population; and the movement that put into their hands a large proportion of the public wealth was so rapid, that, in 1628, at the opening of parliament, the house of commons was three times as rich as the house of lords.²

As this revolution was accomplishing itself, the commons again began to grow uneasy under tyranny. With greater property, greater securities became necessary. Rights exercised by the prince for a long time without dispute, and still without obstacle, came well nigh to be deemed abuses when a much greater number of persons felt their weight. It was asked, had the king of England always possessed them?—whether he ought ever to have possessed them? By degrees, the remembrance of their ancient liberties, of the efforts that had achieved the great charter, and of the maxims it consecrated, returned to the minds of the people. The court spoke with contempt of those old times, as rude and barbarous; the people recalled them with respect and affection, as free and bold. The glorious liberties they had

¹ Clarendon, v. 6.

² Hume, (*History of England*, Oxford, 1820, vi. 209,) cites in confirmation of this assertion, Sanderson and Walker, historians of little authority: I have not been able to discover, in cotemporary writers whose testimony deserves more confidence, so precise a valuation of the comparative wealth of the two houses; but everything attests that the house of commons was much richer than the house of lords.

asserted were no longer of service, and yet all trace of them was not lost. Parliament had not ceased to meet; kings, finding it docile, had often even employed it as an instrument of their power. Under Henry VIII., Mary, and Elizabeth, juries had showed themselves complaisant, servile even, but still the institution existed. The towns had preserved their charters, the corporations their franchises. In short, though long strangers to resistance, the commons still possessed the means of resistance; institutions tending to liberty were not half so much wanting as the power and will to make use of them. The power, however, returned to them with the revolution, which communicated such rapid progress to their material greatness. That the will might not be far behindhand, all that was needed was another revolution, which should inspire a moral greatness, embolden their ambition, elevate their thoughts, make resistance a duty, and dominion a necessity. The Reformation had this effect.

Proclaimed in England by a despot, the Reformation began there in tyranny; scarcely born, she persecuted her partisans and her enemies alike. Henry VIII. with one hand raised scaffolds for the catholics, with the other piled up faggots for the protestants who refused to subscribe to the creed, and approve the government which the new church received from him.

There were, then, from the outset two reformations—that of the king and that of the people: the first unsettled and servile, more attached to temporal interests than to belief, alarmed at the movement which had given it birth, and seeking to borrow from catholicism all that in separating from catholicism it could retain; the other, spontaneous, ardent, despising worldly considerations, accepting all the consequences of its principles—in a word, a true moral revolution, undertaken in the name and with the ardour of faith.

United for some time—under queen Mary by common suffering, and at the accession of Elizabeth by common joy—the two reformations could not long fail to separate, and turn against each other. And such was their situation, that politics became necessarily mixed up in their debates. In separating herself from the independent head of the Catholic church, the Anglican church had lost all its own strength, and no longer held her rights or her power but as of the

power and rights of the sovereigns of the state. She was thus bound to the cause of civil despotism, and constrained to profess its maxims in order to legitimate her own origin, to serve its interests in order to preserve her own. On their part, the nonconformists, in attacking their religious adversaries, found themselves also compelled to attack the temporal sovereign, and in accomplishing the reformation of the church, to assert the liberties of the people. The king had succeeded to the pope; the Anglican clergy, successors of the Catholic clergy, no longer acted but in the name of the king : throughout, in a dogma, a ceremony, a prayer, the erection of an altar, the fashion of a surplice, the royal will was compromised in common with that of the bishops, the government in common with the discipline and faith.

In this perilous necessity of a double struggle against the prince and the church, of a simultaneous reformation in religion and state, the nonconformists at first hesitated. Popery, and everything that resembled it, was odious and unlawful in their sight ; but not so, as yet, royal authority, even though despotic. Henry VIII. had begun the reformation, Eliza beth saved it. The boldest puritans hesitated to measure the rights, to prescribe limits to a power to which they owed so much ; and if at intervals individuals made a step towards this holy object, the astonished nation thanked them silently, but did not follow them.

But something must be done; reform must either retrograde, or lay its hand too upon government, which alone obstructed its progress. By degrees, men's minds grew more daring; the force of conscience gave boldness to ideas and designs: religious creeds required political rights; people began to inquire why they did not enjoy them? who had usurped them? by what right? what was the way to regain them? The obscure citizen, who, lately, at the mere name of Elizabeth, would have bent low in fearful respect, and who, probably, would never have turned towards the throne a bolder look if in the tyranny of the bishops he had not recognised that of the queen, now sternly interrogated both the one and the other as to their pretensions, when constrained to do so in defence of his faith. It was more particularly among the private gentry, the freeholders, burghers, and the commonalty, that this feeling of inquiry and resistance in the matter

of government, as well as in matter of faith, diffused itself, for it was among them that religious reform was fermenting and making its way. Less interested about religious creeds, the court and a part of the lower nobility were content with the innovations of Henry VIII. and his successors, and supported the Anglican church from conviction, indifference, self-interest, or loyalty. Less connected with the interests, and at the same time more exposed to the violence of power, the English commons thenceforward entirely changed, with reference to royalty, their attitude and their ideas. Day by day, their timidity lessened, and their ambition grew. The views of the citizen and the freeholder, even of the peasant, were raised above his condition. He was a Christian; in his own house, among his friends, he boldly examined the mysteries of divine power; what terrestrial power then was so exalted that he must abstain from considering it? In his Bible he read the laws of God; to obey them, he was forced to resist other laws; he must needs then ascertain where the latter should stop short. He who seeks to know the limits of a master's rights will soon seek also their origin: the nature of royal power, of all powers, their ancient limits, their recent usurpations, the conditions and the sources of their legitimacy, became throughout England the subject of examination and conversation: examination, at first timid, and undertaken rather from necessity than choice; conversation, for a long time secret, and which, even when held, the people were afraid to carry to any length, but which gave greater freedom, and a boldness hitherto unknown to mind. Elizabeth, however popular and respected, felt the effects of this growing disposition,¹ and rigorously resisted it, but so as not to encounter actual peril. Matters grew much worse under James. Weak and despised, he wished to be thought a despot; the dogmatic display of his impotent pretensions only provoked fresh daring, which again he irritated without repressing. The popular thought soared high and free—it had no longer any check; the monarch was an object of ridicule, his favourites, of indignation. On the throne, at court, haughty pride was without power, even without effect; the base corruption to which it resorted, inspired thinking men with

¹ See Appendix, No. 1.

profound disgust, and brought the highest rank within the reach of degrading insults on the part of the populace. It was no longer the privilege of lofty minds to look nobility in the face, and measure it coolly: the commonest citizens equally asserted this right. The opposition soon appeared as haughty and more confident than power; and it was not the opposition of the great barons, of the house of lords, it was that of the house of commons, resolved to take in the state a place, to assume over the government an influence, which it had never attained. Their indifference to the pompous menaces of the prince, their haughty, though respectful language, manifested that everything was changed; that they thought proudly, and were determined to act authoritatively; and the secret impression of this moral revolution was already so diffused, that, in 1621, when awaiting a committee of the commons, which came to present him with a severe remonstrance, James said, with an irony less painful to himself than it would have been could he have foreseen coming events: "Place twelve arm-chairs, I am going to receive twelve kings."¹

And, in fact, it was almost a senate of kings that an absolute monarch called around his throne, when Charles I. convoked the parliament. Neither the prince nor the people, more especially the latter, had as yet clearly ascertained the principle, or measured the compass of their pretensions; they approached each other, with the design and sincere hope of union, but at bottom disunion was already complete, for both the one and the other thought as sovereigns.

As soon as the session was opened, the commons began to look closely into every department of government; external and domestic affairs, negotiations, alliances, the application of past subsidies and of future subsidies, the state of religion, the repression of popery; nothing appeared to them beyond their cognizance. They complained of the Royal Navy, as affording inadequate protection to English commerce (Aug. 11, 1625,) of Dr. Montague, the king's chaplain, for defending the Romish church and preaching up passive obedience, (7th July.) They expected from the king alone the redress of all their grievances, but meantime evinced their determination to

¹ Rapin's Hist. of England, viii. 163; Kenner's Hist. of England, iii. 743.

interfere in every case by inquiries, petitions, and the expression of their opinion.

They but slightly reproached the government of Charles; it was only just commencing. Yet so extended and encrogetic an examination of public affairs appeared to him already an encroachment; the freedom of speech offended him. One of the court party, Mr. Edward Clarke, essayed a complaint on this head in the house: "unbecoming and bitter words," he said, "had been made use of." A general cry summoned him to appear at the bar, and explain; he persisted; and the house was on the point of expelling him, (Aug. 6.)

Their speech, indeed, was sufficiently bold, though in humble terms. "We do not desire, as 5 Henry IV. or 29 Henry VI., the removing from about the king any evil counsellors. We do not request a choice by name, as 14 Edward II., 3, 5, 11, Richard II., 8 Henry IV., or 31 Henry VI.; nor to swear them in parliament, as 35 Edward I., 9 Edward II., or 5 Richard II.; or to line them out their directions of rule, as 43 Henry III., and 8 Henry VI.; or desire that which Henry III. did promise in his 42nd year: '*Se acta omnia per assensum magnatum de concilio suo electorum, et sine eorum assensu nihil.*' We only in loyal duty offer up our humble desires, that since his majesty hath, with advised judgment, elected so wise, religious, and worthy servants, to attend him in that high employment, he will be pleased to advise with them together, a way of remedy for these disasters in state, brought on by long security and happy peace; and not be led with young and simple council." Thus spoke (6 Aug.) sir Robert Cotton, a learned, eloquent, and moderate man; and the commons, while protesting with him that they had no intention of imitating the boldness of the old parliaments, congratulated themselves upon hearing it recalled to mind.

The king grew angry, but did not openly complain. Such language, though disagreeable, did not appear to him as yet dangerous. Besides, he wanted subsidies. The last parliament had ardently demanded war with Spain; the new one could not refuse to support it. Charles insisted that without delay the means of prosecuting it should be furnished him, promising to redress just grievances.

But the house no longer trusted to promises, not even to

those of a king who had not yet broken any, and whom they esteemed. Princes inherit the faults as well as the thrones of their predecessors. Charles thought the people should fear nothing from him, as he had done no ill; the people, that all the sources of past ills should be extirpated, that nothing might be feared for the future. The commons only gave, at first, a small subsidy, and the customs duties were only voted for a year. This last resolution seemed an insult, and the lords refused to sanction it. Why should the commons, demanded the court people, place less confidence in the present king than in his predecessors? They all had the customs duties voted for the continuance of their reign. Yet his majesty had fully exhibited, with a rare sincerity, the state of the finances, refusing no document, no voucher, no explanation, that was required. The urgency of the public necessities was evident; there was little wisdom, thought the lords, in angering so soon, without motive, a young prince who showed himself so inclined to live on good terms with the parliament.

The commons did not say they would not grant larger subsidies; but they proceeded with the examination of grievances; resolved, though they did not announce the intention, to obtain, first and foremost of all things, their redress. The king was indignant that they should thus dare to prescribe to him, and suppose that he would yield to force, or permit himself to be set aside. It was a usurpation of that sovereignty which belonged to him alone, and which in no case he would suffer to be brought in question. Parliament was dissolved, (Aug. 12.)

Thus, notwithstanding their mutual good will, the prince and the people had only met to disagree; they separated without either the one or the other side feeling itself weak or believing itself in the wrong, equally certain of the legitimacy of its pretensions, equally resolved to persevere in them. The commons protested that they were devoted to the king, but would not yield up to him their liberties. The king said he respected the liberties of his subjects, but that he would take care to govern by himself, without their interference. And he immediately set about it. Orders from the council to the lord lieutenants of the counties enjoined them to raise by way of loan the money the king wanted. They

were to apply for this to the rich citizens in their districts, and to send to the court the names of those who should refuse to lend, or even be tardy in their loans. They calculated at once upon affection and upon fear. At the same time, the fleet sailed on an expedition against Cadiz, the bay of which was crowded with richly-freighted vessels. In order, meanwhile, to gratify the people, the clergy were directed to proceed against the Catholics, who were forbidden to go further than five miles from their place of abode, without previous permission, were ordered to recall from the continent the children whom they had sent there to be educated, and were disarmed. The commons demanded their own liberties; they were given. instead, a little tyranny over their enemies.

This contemptible expedient did not content them: besides, the persecution, even of the Catholics, was equivocal, and matter of suspicion; the king sold them dispensations, or granted them pardons, under his own hand. The loan brought but little money to the treasury; the expedition against Cadiz failed; the public attributed the failure to the unskillfulness of the admiral and the drunkenness of the troops; the government was accused of neither knowing how to choose its generals, nor how to regulate the conduct of its soldiers.* Six months had scarcely passed, when a second parliament was thought necessary, (Feb. 6, 1626.) Rancour had not yet taken deep root in the soul of the young king; and his despotism was at once self-confident and timid. He thought the commons would be delighted to return so soon; perhaps he even hoped that the firmness he had shown would render them more docile. He had, moreover, taken measures to keep from parliament the most popular orators. The earl of Bristol, a personal enemy of the duke of Buckingham, received no summons to attend. Sir Edward Coke, sir Robert Philips, sir Thomas Wentworth, sir Francis Seymour,¹ and others, being named sheriffs of their counties, could not be elected for them. It was not doubted but in their absence the commons would be submissive; for the people love the king, it was said; 'tis only a few factious men that lead them astray.

¹ Seven in all: the three others, of less note, were Sir Grey Palmer, Sir William Fleetwood, and Mr. Edward Alford.

But the commons, too, had their notion, that the king was being led astray, and that to restore him to his people, it was only necessary to remove him from the favourite. The first parliament had limited itself to exacting from the throne, by delaying the subsidies, the redress of public grievances. The present resolved to assail, at the very foot of the throne, the author of their grievances. The duke of Buckingham was impeached, (Feb. 21.)

The duke was one of those men who seem born to shine in courts, and to displease nations. Handsome, presumptuous, magnificent, frivolous, but daring, sincere and warm in his attachments, open and haughty in his hatreds, alike incapable of virtue or hypocrisy, he governed without political design, troubling himself neither about the interests of the country, nor even those of power, wholly occupied with his own greatness, and with exhibiting, in dazzling display, his co-royalty. On one occasion he had endeavoured to render himself popular, and had succeeded: the rupture of the intended marriage of Charles with the infant was his work. But public favour was, with him, only a means of obtaining ascendancy over the king, so that when public favour quitted him, he scarcely observed its loss, so full of proud joy was he at retaining over Charles the influence he had insolently exercised over James I. He had no talent whereby to support his ambition; frivolous passions were the sole aim of his intrigues; to seduce a woman, to ruin a rival, he compromised, with arrogant carelessness, now the king, now the country. The empire of such a man seemed to a people becoming, day by day, more grave and serious, an insult as well as a calamity; and the duke continued to usurp the highest offices of the state,¹ without appearing, even in the eyes of the populace, anything better than an upstart without glory—a daring and incapable favourite.

The attack of the commons was violent: it was difficult to

¹ He was duke, marquis, and earl of Buckingham, earl of Coventry, viscount Villiers, baron of Whaddon, lord high admiral of England and Ireland, governor-general of the seas and navy, master of the horse, lieutenant-general-admiral, commander-in-chief, warden of the cinque ports, governor of Dover castle, keeper of the royal forests south of Trent, lord high keeper, high steward of Westminster, constable of Windsor castle, gentleman of the bedchamber, knight of the garter, privy councillor, &c. The royal domains he had managed to have given him were valued at £84,899, &c.—Brodie, Hist. of the British Empire, &c. ii. 122.

prove against Buckingham any legal crime; the house resolved (Apr. 22,) that public report alone was sufficient ground on which to proceed; and it collected together all the leading charges adduced by general rumour.¹ The duke repelled them—most of them, at all events—satisfactorily, but without any advantage to himself. It was misgovernment that the commons wished to reform. Innocent of theft, murder, or treason, Buckingham was not less pernicious. The boldness of the commons gave courage to court enmities. The earl of Bristol, in March, 1626, complained of not having been summoned to parliament.² Buckingham, who feared, wished to keep him at a distance. The lords acknowledged the earl's right, and Charles sent him a summons, but accompanied it with an order to remain on his estates. The earl appealed a second time to the house of lords, beseeching them to examine whether the liberties of all the peers of the realm did not require that he should come and take his seat. The king immediately impeached him of high treason, (May 1.)³ In self-defence, Bristol, in his turn, impeached Buckingham;⁴ and Charles saw his favourite pursued at once by the representatives of the people and by an old courtier.

It was a step at once endangering his power, and deeply offensive to his pride. They had not been able to convict Buckingham of any crime: this blow, then, was aimed at his minister and his friend. He said to the commons: "I must let you know, that I will not allow any of my servants to be questioned amongst you, much less such as are of eminent place and near unto me. The old question was, 'What shall be done to the man whom the king will honour?' But now it hath been the labour of some to seek what may be done against him whom the king thinks fit to honour. I see you specially aim at the duke of Buckingham; I wonder what hath so altered your affections towards him. I do well remember; that in the last parliament, in my father's time, when he was the instrument to break the treaties, all of you (and yet I cannot say all; for I know some of you are changed, but yet the house of commons is always the same) did so much honour and respect him, that all the honour conferred on him

¹ Parl. Hist. ii. 32.

² Ib. 72

³ Ib. 79

⁴ Ib. 86

was too little; and what he hath done since to alter and change your minds, I wot not; but can assure you he hath not meddled, or done anything concerning the public or commonwealth, but by special directions and appointment, and as my servant; and is so far from gaining or improving his estate thereby, that I verily think he hath rather impaired the same. I wish you would hasten my supply, or else it will be worse for yourselves; for if any ill happen, I think I shall be the last that shall feel it."¹ At the same time, he forbade the judges to answer the questions which the upper house had submitted to them upon a point in the earl of Bristol's² case, fearing their answer would be in that nobleman's favour.

The judges were silent; but the commons did not desist. Eight of its members were appointed to support, in a conference with the upper house, the impeachment of Buckingham (May 3).³ As soon as the conference was over, the king caused two of the commissioners, sir Dudley Digges and sir John Eliot, to be sent to the Tower for insolence of speech,⁴ (May 11.) The incensed commons declared they would do nothing till these gentlemen were set at liberty.⁵ In vain the friends of the court sought to frighten them as to the fate of parliament itself,⁶ (May 13;) their threats only appeared an insult, and they were fain to offer to the house an apology for having insinuated that the king might very likely be tempted to govern alone, like the princes on the continent. The two prisoners speedily quitted the Tower.

On its part, the lords demanded also that lord Arundel, whom the king had caused to be arrested during the sitting of parliament, should be set at liberty, and Charles here, in like manner, gave way,⁷ (June 8.)

Wearied of seeing himself defeated by adversaries whom he had himself called together and could disperse, after trying the effect of various overtures of civility which were always received with great delight, but which, meaning nothing, prevented nothing, hearing that the commons were preparing a general

¹ Parl. Hist. ii. 49.

² Ibid. 100.

³ Journals, Commons. They were, sir Dudley Digges, Mr. Herbert, Mr. Selden, Mr. Glanville, Mr. Pym, Mr. Whitby, Mr. Wandesford, and sir John Eliot.

⁴ P. Hist. ii. 103;

⁵ Ib. 110.

⁶ Ib. 120.

⁷ Ib. 132.

remonstrance, Charles resolved to relieve himself from a position that humiliated him in the eyes of Europe and in his own. A rumour went abroad that parliament was about to be dissolved. The upper house, which began to seek popular favour, hastened to address a petition to the king to dissuade him from this design; and all the peers accompanied the committee charged with its presentation. "No, not a minute!" exclaimed Charles. The dissolution was immediately declared, (June 15,)¹ and a royal proclamation explained the reasons for it. The projected remonstrance of the commons was publicly burnt, and whoever possessed a copy of it, was ordered to burn it also.² Lord Arundel was placed under arrest in his own house, Bristol in the Tower;³ the duke of Buckingham thought himself saved, and Charles felt himself a king.

His joy was as short as his foresight. absolute power has also its necessities. Engaged in a ruinous war against Spain and Austria, Charles had not at his disposal an army which he could employ in conquering at the same time his enemies and his subjects. Few and badly disciplined, his troops were exceedingly expensive; puritanism reigned in the navy; he dared not trust the militia, far more under the influence of the citizens and country gentlemen than of the king. He had removed adversaries, but not embarrassments and obstacles; and the insane pride of Buckingham now created new troubles. To avenge himself on the cardinal de Richelieu, who had prevented him from returning to Paris, to follow up his daring success with Anne of Austria, he induced his master to enter into a war with France. The interests of protestantism served as a pretext; it was essential to save Rochelle, then under siege, or the French protestants would be lost. It was hoped that, for this cause, the people would passionately arm themselves; or, at least, would suffer themselves to be oppressed without resistance.

A general loan was ordered, of the same amount as the subsidies which parliament had promised, but not voted. The commissioners were enjoined to interrogate the refractory as to the grounds of their refusal, to learn who had persuaded them, by what arguments, with what design. This was at once an attack upon property and an inquisition into opinion.

¹ P. Hist. ii. 193.

² Ib. 207.

³ Ib. 193. ●

Several regiments were spread over different counties, and quartered upon the inhabitants. The seaports and maritime districts received orders to furnish vessels armed and equipped, the first attempt at ship-money. Twenty were demanded from the city of London; the corporation replied, that to repel the armada of Philip II., queen Elizabeth had required fewer: the answer to this was, that "the precedents in former times were obedience and not direction."¹

To justify this language, the doctrine of passive obedience was ordered to be everywhere preached up. The archbishop of Canterbury, George Abbot, a popular prelate, refused to license the sale in his diocese of a sermon (by Dr. Sibthorp) in support of absolute power; he was suspended, and relegated to Canterbury.²

It soon appeared that too much had been presumed on the passions of the people; they did not permit themselves to be persuaded to forget their liberty for the sake of their creed. Besides, they distrusted the sincerity of this new zeal; leave them free, let a parliament be called, they would lend their reformed brethren on the continent much more solid aid. Many citizens refused to contribute to the loan; some, obscure and powerless, were pressed into the fleet or army; others were cast into prison, or charged with distant missions which they were not in a position to reject. Discontent, though as yet not breaking out into sedition, did not confine itself to murmurs only. Five gentlemen, detained in custody by an order in council, claimed of the court of king's bench, as the inherent right of every Englishman, to be discharged on bail.³ An imperious king and an irritated nation alike pressed the case on to judgment. The king required of the judges to declare, as a principle, that no man arrested by his orders should be admitted to bail; the people demanded to know whether all security was withheld from the defenders of their liberties? The court of justice rejected the application, (Nov. 28, 1627,) and sent the parties back to

¹ Whitelocke, *Memorial of English Affairs*, (London, 1682,) p. 7.

² *Ib.* p. 8.

³ Their names were, sir Thomas Darnel, sir John Corbet, sir Walter Earl, sir John Heveningham, and sir Edward Hampden, (*Rushworth, Historical Collections*, London, 1659; i. 458.) This last must not be mistaken for his cousin, John Hampden, afterwards so celebrated.

prison; but without laying down the general principle the king desired: already, struck with a double fear, the magistrates dared not show themselves either servile or just; and, to obviate as they best might the dilemma, they refused to despotism their consent, to liberty their aid.

In their jealous ardour to maintain all their rights, the people took under their protection even the soldiers who served as the instruments of tyranny. In every direction, complaints were raised of the excesses of these men; to repress them, martial law was enforced. The people took it ill that so arbitrary a power should be exercised without the sanction of parliament, and that Englishmen, soldiers or otherwise, whether employed in persecuting or in protecting their fellow-citizens, should be deprived of the security of the law.

In the midst of this irritation, as yet impotent, but more and more aggressive, news came that the expedition sent to the succour of Rochelle, and which Buckingham commanded in person, had failed, (Oct. 28.) The unskilfulness of the general had caused this failure; he had neither been able to take the isle of Ré, nor to re-embark without losing the best of his troops, officers and soldiers. It was long since England had paid so dear for so much disgrace.¹ In country and town, a multitude of families, beloved and respected by the people, were in mourning. The indignation was universal. The labourer left his fields, the apprentice his shop, to see whether his employer, gentleman or citizen, had not lost a brother, or son; and returned, cursing Buckingham, and accusing the king, to relate to his neighbours the disasters he had heard described, the general sorrow he had witnessed. Losses of another kind came to embitter men's minds; the enemy's navy harassed and interrupted English commerce; its vessels remained in port; the unemployed sailors talked over the reverses of the royal navy, and the causes of their own inaction. From day to day, the gentry, the citizens, the populace, became more closely united in one common resentment.

Buckingham, on his return, notwithstanding his arrogance,

¹ The disaster is painted with a great deal of energy in a letter from Hollis to sir Thomas Wentworth, of the 19th of November, 1627. *Strafford's Letters and Despatches*, (London, 1730,) i. 44.

felt the weight of public hatred and the necessity of saving himself from it; besides which, some expedient must be found, to remove these embarrassments, to procure money. In the way of tyrannical force, all that could be done or thought of had been exhausted. Sir Robert Cotton, as the mildest of the popular party, was called in to council the king. He spoke with wisdom and frankness, insisted on the just grievances of the nation, on the necessity of redressing them in order to obtain its support, and recalled the words of Lord Burleigh to queen Elizabeth: "Win their hearts, and you may have their hands and purses."¹ He advised the calling a fresh parliament, and to reconcile the duke of Buckingham with the public, it was agreed, that in the council where this resolution should be officially adopted, its proposition should proceed from him. The king acceded to sir Robert's suggestion.

The prisons were thrown open;² men who had been cast into them for their resistance to tyranny were suddenly released — insulted yesterday, powerful to-day. The public received them with transport; twenty-seven of them were elected. Parliament met (March 17, 1628.) "Every man," said the king, at the opening of the session, "must now do according to his conscience, wherefore, if you (which God forbid) should not do your duties in contributing what the state at this time needs, I must, in discharge of my conscience, use those other means, which God hath put into my hands, to save that which the follies of some particular men may otherwise hazard to lose. Take not this as a threatening, (for I scorn to threaten any but my equals,) but an admonition from him that, both out of nature and duty, hath most care of your preservation and prosperities."³ The lord-keeper speaking after the king, added: "This mode (of supply), as his majesty hath told you, he hath chosen, not as the only way, but as the fittest; not as destitute of others, but as most agreeable to the goodness of his own most gracious disposition, and to the desire and weal of his people. If this be deferred, necessity and the sword of the enemy will make way to the others. Remember his majesty's admonition; I say, remember it."⁴

¹ Parl. Hist. ii. 212.

² Seventy-eight prisoners were at that time released. Rushworth, i. 473.

³ Parl. Hist. ii. 218.

⁴ Ib. 221.

Thus Charles sought by his language to disguise his situation: a haughty solicitor, sinking under the weight of his faults and failures, he made a threatening display of independent majesty, absolute, superior to all faults, all reverses. He was so infatuated with this idea, that it never entered into his conception, that his state was liable to injury; and full of genuine pride, he thought it due to his honour, to his rank, to reserve to himself the rights, and not to depart from the language of tyranny, even while appealing for the aid of liberty.

The commons were not at all disturbed at his threats; thoughts no less proud, no less inflexible than his own, filled their souls. They were resolved solemnly to proclaim their liberties, to compel power to acknowledge them original and independent, no longer to suffer that any right should pass for a concession, any abuse for a right. Neither leaders nor soldiers were wanting for this great design. The whole nation pressed round the parliament. Within its walls, talented and daring men advised together for the national good. Sir Edward Coke, the glory of the bench, no less illustrious for his firmness than for his learning;¹ sir Thomas Wentworth² afterwards earl of Strafford, young, ardent, eloquent, born to command, and whose ambition was then satisfied with the admiration of his country; Denzil Hollis,³ the younger son of lord Clare, companion in childhood of Charles, but the sincere friend of liberty, and too proud to serve under a favourite; Pym, a learned lawyer, especially versed in the knowledge of the rights and customs of parliament,⁴ a cool and daring man, of a character fitted to act as the cautious leader of popular passions; with many others, destined at a future period, of which none of them had the slightest idea, for such various fortunes, to be the adherents of such utterly opposed parties, yet now united by common principles and common aspirations. To this formidable coalition the court could only oppose the power of habit, the capricious temerity of Buckingham, and the haughty obstinacy of the king.

The first intercourse of the prince and the parliament was

¹ Born at Mileham, Norfolk, 1540; he was then 78 years of age.

² Born in London, April 13, 1593; he was then 35 years of age.

³ Born in 1597, at Houghton, Nottinghamshire; he was then 31 years old.

⁴ Born in 1584, in Somersetshire; he was then 44 years old.

friendly. Notwithstanding his menacing attitude, Charles felt that he must give way; and, while determined to regain all their rights, the commons had the full intention of showing their devotedness to him. Charles was not offended by their freedom of speech; and the speeches were as loyal as they were free. "I humbly beseech this house," said sir B. Rudyard,¹ (March 22) "to be curiously wary and careful to avoid all manner of contestation, personal or real. The hearts of kings are great, as are their fortunes; then are they fitted to yield when they are yielded unto. It is comely and mannerly that princes, in all fair appearance, should have the better of their subjects. Let us give the king a way to come off like himself; for I do verily believe, that he doth with longing expect the occasion. The way to show we are the wise counsellors we should be, is to take a right course to attain the end of our councils, which, in my opinion, may by this means be compassed; by trusting the king, thereby to breed a trust in him towards us." All were not equally animated by these peaceful ideas; there were some sterner minds, which anticipated less fearful evils from a fresh rupture, and better appreciated the incurable nature of absolute power. All, however, showed themselves animated with the same wishes; and the house, taking into consideration, on equal terms, the grievances of the people and the wants of the throne, after a fortnight's session, unanimously voted (April 14) a considerable subsidy, but without passing the vote into a law.

Charles's joy was extreme; he forthwith assembled the council, and informing it of the vote of the house: "I liked parliaments, at first," said he, "yet since, I know not how, I have grown to a distaste of them; but now I am where I was before; I love them, and shall rejoice to meet with my people often. This day I have gained more reputation in Christendom than if I had won many battles." The same joy was displayed by the council; Buckingham thought he must, as well as Charles, emphatically express his gratification; he felicitated the king on so happy a concord with parliament. "This," said he, "is not a gift of five subsidies alone, but the opening of a mine of subsidies, that lieth in their hearts. And now to open my heart and to ease my grief, please you to pardon me

¹ Parl. Hist. ii. 235.

a word more : I must confess I have long lived in pain; sleep hath given me no rest—favours, fortunes no content, such have been my secret sorrows, to be thought the man of separation, that divided the king from his people, and them from him; but I hope it shall appear they were some mistaken minds that would have made me the evil spirit that walketh between a good master and loyal people, by ill offices; whereas, by your majesty's favour, I shall ever endeavour to prove myself a good spirit, breathing nothing but the best services to them all."¹

The secretary of state, Cooke, reported (April 7) to the house the king's satisfaction, and the favour that in all things he was ready to show to parliament. The commons congratulated themselves on this; but Cooke, with the short-sighted meanness of a courtier, also spoke of the duke of Buckingham, and his speech in the council: the house was offended. "Is it that any man," said sir John Eliot, "conceives the mention of others, of what quality soever, can add encouragement or affection to us in our duties and loyalties towards his majesty, or give them greater latitude or extent than naturally they have; or is it to be supposed that the power or interest of any man can add more readiness to his majesty than this gracious inclination towards us gives him? I cannot believe it. I shall readily commend, nay, thank that man, whose endeavours are applied to such offices as may be advantageable for the public; yet, in this manner, so contrary to the customs of our fathers, and the honour of our times, as I cannot, without scandal, apprehend it, so I cannot, without some character of exception, pass it; and therefore I desire that such interposition may be let alone. Now let us proceed to those services that concern him, which, I doubt not, in the end, will render us so real unto him, that we shall need no other help to endear us to his favour."²

This just pride appeared to Charles insolence, to Buckingham a clear symptom of new perils; but neither the one nor the other said anything on the subject, and the house pursued its work.

It had entered into a conference with the upper house to determine in concert the just rights of subjects, and to claim

¹ Parl. Hist. ii. 274.

² Ib. 275.

a new and solemn sanction of them from the prince, (April 3.) Charles, informed of the designs which the commissioners of the commons manifested in these conferences, took great umbrage. He had the house exhorted to hasten the definitive vote of the subsidies, and his minister added,¹ (April 12,) "I must with some grief tell you, that notice is taken, as if this house pressed, not only upon the abuses of power, but upon power itself: this toucheth the king, and us who are supported by that power. Let the king hear of any abuses of power, he will willingly hear us; and let us not bend ourselves against the extension of his royal power, but contain ourselves within those bounds, that we meddle only with pressures and abuses of power, and we shall have the best satisfaction that ever king gave."

On their part, the peers, servile or timid, persuaded the commons to content themselves with requiring from the king a declaration, to the effect, that the great charter, with the statutes confirming it, were in full force, that the liberties of the English people also were in force, as in times past, and that the king would make use of the prerogatives inherent in his sovereign power, only for the benefit of his subjects, (April 23.)²

The king assembled both houses in a solemn sitting, declared that he regarded the great charter as inviolate, the ancient statutes as inviolable, and called upon them to rely, for the maintenance of their rights, on his royal word, in which, he said, they would find more security than any new law could, give them, (April 28.)³

The commons did not allow themselves to be either intimidated or seduced; the recent abuses had braved the power, altogether surpassing the foresight of the old laws; there must be new, explicit guarantees, invested with the sanction of the whole parliament. It was doing nothing to have vaguely renewed promises, so often broken, statutes so long forgotten. Without wasting many words about the matter, respectful, but inflexible, the house drew up the famous bill, known under the name of the 'Petition of Rights,' adopted it, and transmitted it to the upper house for its assent. (May 8.)

¹ Parl. Hist. ii. 278² Ib. 320.³ Ib. 332.

The lords had nothing to say against a bill which consecrated acknowledged liberties, or repressed abuses universally condemned. But, the king returned to the charge, again demanding that they should rely on his word, and offering to confirm, by a new bill, the great charter and the ancient statutes; addressing advice upon advice to the peers, to the commons message upon message; deeply irritated, but cautious and mild in his speech, proclaiming his firm resolution neither to suffer any restriction in any of his rights, nor to abuse those which he enjoyed.

The perplexity of the peers was great. How secure the liberties of the people, without depriving the king of absolute power? for such was the question. They tried an amendment: the bill was adopted with this addition: "We humbly present this petition to your majesty, not only with a care of preserving our own liberties, but with due regard to leave entire that sovereign power wherewith your majesty is trusted for the protection, safety, and happiness of your people," (May 17.)¹

When the bill thus amended came back to the commons: "Let us look unto the records," said Mr. Alford, "and see what they are: what is 'sovereign power?' Bodin saith, that it is free from any conditions. By this we shall acknowledge a regal as well as a legal power; let us give that to the king the law gives him, and no more." "I am not able," said Pym, "to speak to this question, for I know not what it is. All our petition is for the laws of England; and this power seems to be another distinct power from the power of the law. I know how to add 'sovereign' to the king's person, but not to his power; and we cannot leave to him a 'sovereign power,' for we never were possessed of it." "If we do admit of this addition," said sir Thomas Wentworth, "we shall leave the subject worse than we found him. Our laws are not acquainted with 'sovereign power,'" (May 17.)²

The commons kept their ground; the public became more and more pressing; the peers, not bold enough to demand liberty openly, were not bold enough either to sanction tyranny. They withdrew their amendment out of regard for them; an unmeaning phrase was substituted for it, and

¹ Parl. Hist. ii. 335.

² 1b.

the petition of rights, adopted by both houses, was solemnly presented to the king, who, conquered himself, at last promised to receive it, (May 28.)

His answer (June 2) was vague, evasive;¹ he did not sanction the bill, and only repeated what the house had refused to be content with.

Victory seemed gliding away from the commons; on meeting next day, they renewed the attack, (June 3.)² Sir John Eliot passionately recapitulated all the national grievances; the usher had orders to remain at the door, to see that no member went out, under pain of being sent to the Tower. It was resolved that a general remonstrance should be presented to the king; the committee of subsidies was charged with the drawing it up.

At this point, fear came over some of the members, that legitimate fear which arises at the prospect of mighty convulsion, and without asking who is in the right, or what is to be done, calls out to pause, when its party begins to rush forward with what it deems precipitate passion. Sir John Eliot was charged with being actuated by personal enmity; sir Thomas Wentworth, with imprudence; sir Edward Coke, they said, had always been obstinate and intractable.³ The king thought this state of things might give him a respite, if not the means of fully recovering his ground. He forbade the house thenceforth to meddle with affairs of state, (June 5.)⁴

The whole house was in a consternation; this was too much, an insult in the opinion of even the most moderate. All were silent: "Our sins are so exceeding great," at length said sir John Eliot, "that unless we speedily turn to God, God will remove himself further from us; ye know with what affection and integrity we have proceeded hitherto to have gained his majesty's heart! I doubt a misrepresentation to his majesty hath drawn this mark of his displeasure upon us. It is said also, as if we cast some aspersions on his majesty's ministers; I am confident no minister, how dear soever, can——"

At these words, the speaker suddenly rose from his chair, and said, with tears in his eyes, "There is a command laid upon me to interrupt any that should go about to lay an

¹ Parl. Hist. ii. 374.

² Ib. 380.

³ Ib. 385.

⁴ Ib. 401.

aspersion on the ministers of state." Upon this sir John sat down.

Sir Dudley Digges said, "Unless we may speak of these things in parliament, let us arise and be gone, or sit still and do nothing." Hereupon there was a deep silence in the house, which was broken by

Sir Nathaniel Rich; "We must now speak, or for ever hold our peace," said he; "for us to be silent when king and kingdom are in this calamity is not fit. The question is, shall we secure ourselves by silence; yea or nay? I know it is more for our own security, but it is not for the security of those whom we serve. Let us think on them: some instruments desire a change; we fear his majesty's safety and the safety of the kingdom. Shall we sit still and do nothing, and so be scattered. Let us go to the lords and show our dangers, that we may then go to the king together, with our representations thereof."

Suddenly the house passed from stupor to rage. All the members rose, all spoke at once, amidst utter confusion. "The king," said Mr. Kirton, "is as good a prince as ever reigned; it is the enemies to the commonwealth that have so prevailed with him; therefore let us aim now to discover them; and I doubt not but God will send us hearts, hands, and swords, to cut all his and our enemies' throats."—"It is not the king," answered old Coke, "but the duke (a great cry of, "Tis he, 'tis he!" was shouted on all sides,) that saith, 'We require you not to meddle with state government, or the ministers thereof.'"¹ The speaker had left his chair; disorder increased, and no one attempted to calm it, for the most prudent men had nothing to say: anger is sometimes legitimate, even in the eyes of those who never get into a passion themselves.

While the house, a prey to this tumult, was meditating the most violent resolutions, the speaker went out secretly, and hastened to inform the king of his imminent peril.² Fear passed from the house to the court. The next day a milder message was sent, in explanation of the one which had caused such irritation:³ but words were not enough. The commons remained much agitated; they discussed the subject of the German troops, already levied by Buckingham,

¹ Parl. Hist. ii. 408.

² Ib

³ Ib. 406.

and who were shortly to disembark; one member affirmed that, the evening before, twelve German officers had arrived in London, and that two English vessels had received orders to bring over the soldiers.¹ The subsidies were still in suspense. Charles and his favourite feared longer to brave an opposition daily more powerful. They made no doubt that the full sanction of the petition of rights would suffice to calm everything. The king went to the house of lords, where the commons were also assembled, (7 June.) They had been mistaken, he said, in supposing that in his first answer there was any by-view, and he was ready to give one that would dissipate all suspicion. The petition was read anew, and Charles answered by the usual form—"Soit fait droit comme il est désiré."

The commons returned triumphant; they had at last achieved the solemn acknowledgment of the liberties of the English people. To this all publicity must be given; it was resolved that the petition of rights, printed with the king's last answer, should be diffused all over the country, and enrolled, not only in both houses, but also in the courts of Westminster. The bill of subsidies was definitively adopted. Charles thought his trials were over: "I have done my part," said he; "wherefore if this parliament hath not a happy conclusion, the sin is yours; I am free of it."²

But an old evil is not so soon cured, and the ambition of an irritated nation is not appeased with a first success. The passing of the bill of rights was evidently not sufficient. The reform of principles only was accomplished; this was nothing without reform in practice; and to secure this, there must be a reform of the king's council. Now Buckingham still kept his position, and the king continued to levy the customs duties without the sanction of parliament. Enlightened by experience as to the danger of delay, blinded by passion as to that of too abrupt and too harsh demands, pride and hatred combining with the instinct of necessity, the commons resolved to deal without delay the last blows. In a week, two new remonstrances were drawn up, one against the duke, the other to establish that tonnage and poundage, like other taxes, might only be levied by law, (13 and 21 June.)³

¹ Parl. Hist., ii. 408.

² Ib. 409.

³ Ib. 420, 431

The king lost all patience, and, resolved to give himself at least some respite, he went to the house of lords, had the commons summoned, and prorogued the parliament, (June 26.)

Two months afterwards, the duke of Buckingham was murdered, (Aug. 23.) Sewn up in the hat of Felton, his assassin, was found a paper, in which the last remonstrance of the house was referred to.¹ Felton did not fly, or defend himself; he merely said that he regarded the duke as the enemy of the kingdom, shook his head when spoken to about accomplices, and died with composure, confessing, however, that he had done wrong.²

Charles was greatly disturbed at the murder, and indignant at the joy which the multitude manifested at it. Upon the close of the session, he had endeavoured to gratify the public feeling, by restraining the preachers of passive obedience, and especially by severities against the papists, the scape-goats of every reconciliation between the prince and the country. The assassination of Buckingham, in which the people saw their deliverance, threw the king back into tyranny. He restored his favour to the adversaries of parliament: Dr. Montague, whom the commons had prosecuted, was promoted to the bishoprick of Chichester; Dr. Mairwaring, whom the house of lords had condemned, received a rich benefice; bishop Laud,³ already famous for passionate devotion to the principle of high power in king and church, passed to the see of London. The king's public conduct corresponded with these court favours: tonnage and poundage were levied with rigour; and the irregular tribunals continued to suspend the course of law. Returned thus noiselessly to the path of despotism, Charles had now somewhat more prospect of success than before: he had detached from the popular party the most brilliant of its leaders, the most eloquent of its orators. Sir Thomas Wentworth, created a baron, entered the privy council, despite the reproaches, nay, the threats, of his former friends: "I shall meet you in Westminster Hall," said Pym to him, bidding him adieu at their last friendly interview; but Wentworth,

¹ Appendix No. II.

² Clarendon, i. 53; State Trials, iii. 371.

³ Born at Reading; 1573. He was at this time bishop of Bath and Wells.

ambitious and haughty, dashed passionately on towards greatness, far from foreseeing how odious, how fatal, he would one day be to liberty. Other defections followed his;¹ and Charles, surrounded with new councillors, more staid, more able, less decried than Buckingham, saw without apprehension the approach of the second session of parliament, (20 Jan. 1629.)

The commons had scarcely assembled before they proceeded to ascertain what effect had been given to the bill of rights, (21 Jan.) They learned that instead of the king's second answer, it was the first, the evasive and rejected one, which had been added to it. Norton, the king's printer, owned that the very day after the prorogation, he had received orders thus to alter the legal text, and to suppress all the copies which contained the true answer, that of which Charles had boasted, when he said, "I have done my part; I am free of it."

The commons sent for the papers, verified the fact of the alteration, and said no more about it, as if ashamed to expose too publicly so gross a violation of faith: but their silence did not promise oblivion.²

All the attacks were renewed against the toleration of papists, the favour granted to false doctrines, the depravation of morals, the ill distribution of dignities and employments, the proceedings of the irregular courts, the contempt of the liberties of subjects.³

So great was the excitement of the house, that one day it listened in silence and with favour to a man new to them, badly dressed, of a common appearance, who, addressing them for the first time, denounced, in furious and very indifferent language, the indulgence of a bishop to some obscure preacher, a rank papist, as he called him. This man was Oliver Cromwell,⁴ (Feb. 11.)

Charles essayed in vain to wrest from the commons the concession of the tonnage and poundage duties, the only object for which he had assembled them. He employed new threats, new persuasions, admitting, that he held these taxes, like all others, of the pure gift of his people, and that to par-

¹ Sir Dudley Digges, Sir Edw. Lyttleton, Noy, Wandesford, &c.

² Parl. Hist. ii. 435.

³ Ib. 438, 460, 473.

⁴ Ib. 464: Memoirs of Warwick, 247.

liament alone it belonged to establish them, but insisted, at the same time, that they should be granted him for the whole of his reign, as they had been to most of his predecessors.¹ The commons were inflexible; this was the only weapon of defence against absolute power which remained to them. With one excuse after another they persevered in delay, and daily set forth their grievances, but without any exact aim, without putting forward, as in the preceding session, any clear and precise propositions, for they were all this time a prey to violent but vague agitations, disturbed with the sensation of an evil they knew not how to cure. The king grew impatient; they refused his demand without proffering any of their own, without laying any application before him, which he might reject or sanction; it had, he felt, an air of pure malevolence, of being a mere plan for impeding his government. Mention was made that he intended to prorogue parliament. Sir John Eliot at once (March 2) proposed a new remonstrance against the levying of the duties in dispute. The speaker, alleging an order from the king, refused to put the motion to the vote. The house insisted: he left the chair. Hollis, Valentine, and other members, forced him back to it, despite the efforts of the court party, who endeavoured to rescue him from their hands. "God's wounds," said Hollis, "you shall sit till it please the house to rise." "I will not say I will not," cried the speaker, "but I dare not." But passion was now without curb; they compelled him to resume his seat. The king, informed of the tumult, sent orders to the serjeant-at-arms to withdraw with the mace, which, by custom, would suspend all deliberation: the serjeant was kept in his chair like the speaker, the keys of the hall were taken from him, and a member, sir Miles Hobart, took charge of them. The king sent a second messenger to announce the dissolution of parliament; he found the doors locked on the inside, and could not gain admittance. Charles, in a paroxysm of fury, sent for the captain of his guards, and ordered him to go and force the doors. But, in the interval, the commons had retired, after having carried a resolution which declared the levying of tonnage and poundage illegal, and those guilty of high treason who should levy or even pay them.²

¹ Parl. Hist. ii. 442

² Ib. 487—491.

All accommodation was impossible: the king went to the house of lords, 10th March. "I never came here," said he, "on so unpleasing an occasion, it being for the dissolution of parliament; the disobedient carriage of the lower house hath alone caused this dissolution. Yet they would mistake me wonderfully that think I lay the fault equally upon all the lower house; for, as I know, there are many as dutiful and loyal subjects as any are in the world, so I know it is only some vipers amongst them that have cast this mist of difference before their eyes. As those evil affected persons must look for their reward, so you that are here of the higher house, may justly claim from me that protection and favour that a good king oweth to his loyal and faithful nobility."¹ The dissolution was pronounced. Immediately afterwards, appeared a proclamation, setting forth: "That whereas, for several ill ends, the calling again of a parliament is divulged, howsoever his majesty hath showed, by his frequent meeting with his people, his love to the use of parliaments; yet this late abuse having, for the present, driven his majesty unwillingly out of that course, it will be considered presumption for any one to prescribe to him any time for the calling of that assembly."²

Charles kept his word, and now only occupied himself with the project of governing alone.

¹ Parl. Hist. 402.

² Ib. 525.

BOOK THE SECOND.

1629—1640.

Intensions of the king and his council—Prosecution of the leading members of parliament—Apparent apathy of the country—Struggle of the ministry and court—The queen—Strafford—Laud—Want of cohesion in, and discredit of government—Civil and religious tyranny—Its effects on the different classes of the nation—Trial of Prynne, Burton, and Bastwick—Of Hampden—Insurrection of Scotland—First war with the Scots—Peace of Berwick—Short parliament of 1640—Second war with Scotland—Its bad success—Convocation of the long parliament.

NOTHING is so dangerous as to take a system of government as it were on trial, with the idea that one may at any time resort to another. Charles had committed this fault. He had attempted to govern in concert with the parliament; but with the full persuasion, however, as he frequently intimated, that if parliament was too troublesome he should be able to do perfectly well without it. He entered upon the career of despotism with the same heedlessness, proclaiming his intention to adhere to it, but fully believing that, after all, if necessity became too strong for him, he could at any time have recourse to parliament.

His most able councillors were of the same opinion. Neither Charles nor any about him had, at this time, conceived the design of abolishing for ever the ancient laws of England, the great national council. Short-sighted rather than enterprising, insolent rather than absolutely ill-intentioned, their words, and even their acts, were more daring than their thoughts. The king, they said, had shown himself just and kind towards his people; he had yielded a great deal, granted a great deal. But nothing would satisfy the commons; they required the king to become their dependent, their ward; this he could not do, without ceasing to be king. When the prince

and parliament could not manage to agree, it was for the parliament to give way; for the prince alone was sovereign. Since the commons would not give way, he must perforce govern without them; the necessity was evident; sooner or later the people would understand this, and then, parliament having become wiser, there would be nothing to prevent the king's recalling it, in case of need.

With still less foresight than the council, the court only saw in the dissolution a deliverance from a difficulty. While the house of commons was sitting, the courtiers were by no means at ease; none of them dared to push boldly their fortune, nor enjoy their credit freely. The embarrassments of power impeded the intrigues, and spread a gloom over the festivities of Whitehall. The king was thoughtful, the queen intimidated. Parliament dissolved, this uneasiness and restraint disappeared; frivolous grandeur reassumed its brilliancy, and private ambition its full swing. The court asked for nothing beyond this; and troubled itself in no degree to inquire whether, in the prosecution of its immediate object, it was not aiding to bring about a change in the government of the country.

The people judged otherwise: the dissolution was, in their eyes, a sure symptom of a deep-laid scheme, of a resolution to destroy parliaments. The commons had no sooner separated, than, at Hampton Court, Whitehall, wherever the court assembled, the papists, secret or avowed, the preachers and adherents of absolute power, the men of intrigue and pleasure, indifferent to all creeds, congratulated one another on their triumph; whilst in the Tower, and the principal gaols of London and the provinces, the defenders of the public rights, treated at once with contempt and rigour, were undergoing imprisonment, were under impeachment for what they had said or done in the inviolable sanctuary of parliament.¹ They claimed their privileges, they demanded to be discharged upon bail, and the judges hesitated what to answer, but the king communicated with the judges,² (Sept. 1629;) and the application of the prisoners was refused.

¹ The members arrested were, Denzel Holles, sir Miles Hobart, sir John Eliot, sir Peter Hayman, John Selden, William Coriton, Walter Long, William Stroud, and Benjamin Valentine.—*State Trials*, iii. 236

² *Parl. Hist.* ii. 318, *et seq.*

Their courage did not fail them in this trial : the greater number refused to own themselves guilty of any wrong, or to pay the fines to which they were condemned. They preferred remaining in prison. Sir John Eliot was destined to die there.

While this prosecution was going on, public anger continually increased, and did not hesitate openly to manifest itself. It was a sort of continuation of the parliament, vanquished and dispersed, but still struggling before the judges of the country, through the voice of its leaders. The firmness of the accused kept up the ardour of the people, who constantly saw them pass and repass from the Tower to Westminster, and accompanied them with their acclamations and their prayers. The visible anxiety of the judges afforded some expectations. "All is lost!" was the cry; yet still the public continued to alternate between hope and fear, as in the midst of the battle.

But this great trial ended. Frightened or seduced, some of the accused paid the fine, and, ordered to live at least ten miles from the royal residence, retired to conceal their weakness in their respective counties. The noble steadfastness of the rest was buried in the depth of their dungeons. The people, who saw and heard no more of them, were themselves no longer seen nor heard. Power, not meeting with open opposition, thought the day all its own, and that the nation, from which it had estranged itself, was prostrate beyond recovery. Charles hastened to conclude peace with France, (April 11, 1629,) and Spain, (Nov. 5, 1630;) and found himself at last without rivals at home, without enemies abroad.

For some time, government was an easy matter enough. The citizens for awhile took heed only to their private interests: no discussion, no warm excitement agitated the gentry in their county meetings, the burghers in their town-halls, the sailors in the ports, the apprentices in their shops. It was not that the nation was languishing in apathy, but its activity had taken another direction; it seemed to have forgotten in labour the defeat of liberty. Less ardent than haughty, the despotism of Charles interfered with it very slightly in this new state; the prince meditated no vast designs, he had no uneasy desire for extended and hazardous

glory; he was content to enjoy with dignity his power and his rank. Peace dispensed him from exacting from his subjects heavy sacrifices; and the people gave itself up to agriculture, to commerce, to study, and no ambitious and restless tyranny interposed to impede its efforts, or compromise its interests. Public prosperity accordingly rapidly advanced, order reigned, and this regular and flourishing condition gave to power the appearance of wisdom, to the country that of resignation.

It was around the throne and among its servants that the troubles of government recommenced. As soon as the struggle between the king and the people appeared at an end, two parties disputed which should influence the renovated despotism; the queen and the ministry, the court and the council.

On her arrival in England, the queen had not disguised the dulness she experienced in her new country. Religion, institutions, customs, language, everything displeased her; she had even, just after their union, treated her husband with puerile insolence, and Charles, out of all patience with her passionate outbursts of humour, found himself, on one occasion, driven abruptly to send back to the continent some of the attendants whom she had brought over with her, (July, 1626.) The pleasure of reigning could alone console her for her exile from France; and she reckoned upon the full enjoyment of this satisfaction from the time she ceased to have the awe of parliament before her eyes. Agreeable and lively in her manners, she soon acquired over a young king of highly pure principles, an ascendancy which he admitted with a sort of gratitude, sensibly touched, as it were, by her consenting to enjoy herself at all in his society. But the happiness of a domestic life, dear to the serious mind of Charles, could not satisfy the frivolous, restless, and hard character of Henrietta Maria; she wanted an acknowledged, insolent empire—an empire of display, an empire which should be cognizant of all things, and without whose permission nothing should be said or done; she wanted, in short, power, as power always presents itself to the mind of an arrogant, unthinking woman. Round her rallied, on the one hand, the papists, on

¹ Clarendon, i. 120.

the other, the frivolously ambitious, the petty intriguers, the young courtiers, who had early gone to Paris to learn the secret of pleasing her. All these professed to her alone to look, the one class for fortune, the other for the triumph, or at all events, the deliverance of their faith. It was in her apartments that the leading papists at home, and the emissaries of Rome, discussed their most secret hopes; it was there her favourites displayed the notions, manners, and fashions of the continent.¹ Everything there was foreign, and offensive to the creed and customs of the country; there every day were put forward projects and pretensions that could only be realized by illegal measures or abused favours. The queen took part in these intrigues, assured the plotters of success, claimed sanction for them of the king; nay, required of him that, in order to honour her, as she said, in the eyes of the people, he should consult her on all occasions, and do nothing without her consent. If the king refused her wishes, she would angrily accuse him, that he neither loved her nor knew how to reign. And then Charles, happy to find her solicitous for his power, or as to his love, had no other thought than to dissipate her grief or her anger.

The most servile councillors would scarcely have submitted without resistance to this capricious sway. Charles had two who were deficient neither in mind nor spirit, and who, though devoted to his cause, desired to serve him otherwise than according to the fancies of a woman or the pretensions of a court.

In forsaking his party to attach himself to the king, Strafford² had not been called upon to sacrifice any very fixed principles, or basely to betray his conscience. Ambitious and ardent, he had been a patriot out of hatred to Buckingham, out of a desire for glory, to display in full lustre his talents and his energy of mind, rather than from any righteous or profound conviction. To act, to rise, to govern, was his aim, or rather the necessity of his nature. Entering the service of the crown, he became as earnest in its cause as he theretofore had been in that of liberty, but it was as a grave, proud,

¹ May's History of the Long Parliament. (London, 1647.) Book i. 21.

² He was at this period called lord Wentworth—not being created earl of Strafford till the 12th of January, 1640.

able, unbending minister, not as a frivolous and obsequious courtier. Of a mind too vast to shut itself up in the paltry circle of domestic intrigues, of a pride too hotheaded to give way to court forms and notions, he passionately devoted himself to business, braving all rivalry, breaking down all resistance; eager to extend and strengthen the royal authority, now become his own, but diligent at the same time to re-establish order and repress abuses, to put down private interests he judged illegal, and promote all such general interests as he deemed not dangerous to royalty. A fiery despot, still all love of country, all desire for its prosperity, for its glory, was not extinct in his heart, and he perfectly comprehended upon what conditions, by what means, absolute power must be bought over. An administration arbitrary but powerful, consistent, laborious, holding in scorn the rights of the people, but occupying itself with the public happiness, despising all petty abuses, all minor misgovernment, making subordinate to its will, and to its views, the great equally with the small, the court as well as the nation—this was his aim, this the character of his rule, and which he strove to impress on the government of the king.

The friend of Strafford, archbishop Laud, with less worldly passions, and a more disinterested ardour, brought into the council the same feelings, the same designs. Austere in his conduct, simple in his life, power, whether he served it or himself wielded it, inspired in his mind a fanatical devotion. To prescribe and to punish, this was in his eyes to establish order, and order ever seemed to him justice. His activity was indefatigable, but narrow in its views, violent, and harsh. Alike incapable of conciliating opposing interests, and of respecting rights; he rushed, with head down and eyes closed, at once against liberties and abuses; opposing to the latter his rigid probity, to the former his furious hate, he was as abrupt and uncompromising with the courtiers as with the citizens; seeking no man's friendship, anticipating and able to bear no resistance, persuaded, in short, that power is all-sufficient in pure hands; and constantly the prey of some fixed idea, which ruled him with all the violence of passion, and all the authority of duty.

Such councillors suited the new situation of Charles.

Standing apart from the court, they were less anxious to please it, than to serve their master; and had neither the pompous insolence, nor the idle pretensions of the favourites. They were persevering, laborious, bold, capable, devoted. The government of Ireland had scarcely passed into the hands of Strafford, ere that kingdom, which had till then been only a trouble and expense to the crown, became a source of riches and strength. Its public debt was paid; the revenue, previously collected without system, and squandered without shame, was regularly administered, and soon rose above the expenditure; the nobles were no longer allowed to oppress the people with impunity, or the aristocratic and religious factions to tear each other to pieces, in full liberty, as theretofore. The army, which Strafford found weak, without clothes, without discipline, was recruited, well disciplined, well paid, and ceased to pillage the inhabitants. Favoured by order, commerce flourished, manufactories were established, agriculture advanced. In short, Ireland was governed arbitrarily, harshly, often even with odious violence; but yet, to the interest of general civilization and royal power, instead of being as formerly, a prey to the greedy extortion of revenue officers, high and low, and to the domination of a selfish and ignorant aristocracy.¹

Invested in England, as to civil affairs, with a less extended and less concentrated authority than that of Strafford in Ireland, and less able than his friend, Laud did not fail to pursue the same line of conduct. As commissioner of the treasury, he not only repressed all pilferings and illegitimate expenditure, but applied himself to the thorough understanding of the various branches of the public revenue, and to the finding out by what means its collection could be rendered less onerous to the subject. Vexatious impediments, grave abuses, had been introduced into the administration of the custom duties, for the profit of private interests; Laud listened to the complaints and representations of merchants, employed his leisure in conversing with them, informed himself by degrees as to the general interests of commerce, and freed it from trammels which had materially injured it, without any advantage to the exchequer. In March, 1636, the

office of high treasurer was given, on his recommendation, to Juxon, bishop of London, a laborious, moderate-minded man, who put an end to numberless disorders which had alike been injurious to the crown and to the citizens. To serve, as he fancied, the king and the church, Laud was capable of oppressing the people, of giving the most iniquitous advice; but where neither king nor church was in question, he aimed at good, at truth, and upheld them without fear as to himself, without the slightest consideration for other interests.

If, on the one hand, this administration, upright, diligent, but arbitrary, tyrannical, on occasions, and refusing all responsibility, was too little for the country; on the other, it was a great deal too much for the court. Favourites may succeed there; if they meet with enemies, they also make partisans, and in this conflict of personal interests a skilful intriguer may successfully oppose those he serves to those whom he offends. Such had been Buckingham. But whoever would govern, whether by despotism or by the laws, in the general interest of king or people, must lay his account to have the hatred of all the courtiers; and accordingly it arose among them against Strafford and Laud, quite as intense, and infinitely more manœuvring, than among the people. On Strafford's first appearance at Whitehall, a general sneer curled every lip, at the sudden elevation and somewhat unpolished manners of the country gentleman, who had been more especially heard of as a parliamentary opponent of the court.¹ The austere manners, the theological pedantry, and the bluntness of Laud, were equally disliked there. Both these men were haughty, inattentive, and by no means affable in their manners; they disdained intrigues, counselled economy, and talked of business and necessities which a court does not like to hear about. The queen conceived an aversion for them, for they impeded her influence with the king; the high aristocracy took offence at their power; and ere long the whole court united with the people to attack them, joining vigorously in outcries against their tyranny.

Charles did not forsake them; he had full confidence in their devotedness and ability; their opinions were quite in

¹ Howell's Letters, 1650, Letter 34; Strafford's Letters, i. 79; *Biographia Britannica*, *in vita*.

unison with his own, and he entertained for the profound piety of Laud a respect blended with affection. But in retaining them in his service, despite the court, he was not in a condition to make the court submit to their government. Grave in his deportment and sentiments, his mind was not of sufficient depth or grasp to comprehend the difficulties of absolute power, and the necessity of sacrificing everything to it. Such were, in his eyes, the rights of royalty, that it seemed to him nothing ought to cost him an effort. In the council, he applied himself, regularly and with attention, to public affairs; but this duty fulfilled, he troubled himself very little about them; and the necessity of governing was infinitely less present to his thoughts than the pleasure of reigning. The good or bad temper of the queen, the usages of the court, the prerogatives of the officers of the palace, appeared to him important considerations, which the political interests of his crown could not require him to forget. Hence arose, for his ministers, petty but continual annoyances and difficulties, which the king left them to the full endurance of, thinking he did enough for them and for himself by retaining them in their offices. They were charged to exercise absolutism, yet the power to do so failed them the moment they called for some domestic sacrifice, some measure contrary to the forms and rules of Whitehall. All the time of his administration in Ireland, Strafford was constantly called upon for explanations and apologies; now, he had spoken lightly of the queen, and now again, some influential family had complained of his hauteur; he had to justify his words, his manners, his character; all these idle accusations obliged him to reply, from Dublin, to something that had been said, some rumour that was afloat about him in the palace; and he did not always obtain an assurance in return, which (setting him at ease as to these minor perils) enabled him to carry on without fear the authority yet left him.¹

Thus, notwithstanding the energy and zeal of his principal councillors, notwithstanding the tranquil state of the country, notwithstanding the private worth of the king's conduct, and the proud bearing of his language, the government was without strength and without consideration. Assailed by domestic

¹ Strafford's Letters, i. 128, 138, 142, 144; ii. 42, 105, 126, &c.

dissensions, carried away alternately by opposing influences, sometimes arrogantly shaking off the yoke of the laws, sometimes giving way before the slightest difficulties, it proceeded without any settled plan; it forgot, at every turn, its own designs. It had abandoned, on the continent, the cause of protestantism, and had even forbidden lord Scudamore, its ambassador at Paris, to attend divine service in the chapel of the reformers, because the forms did not come near enough to the rites of the English church.¹ And yet it allowed the marquis of Hamilton to raise in Scotland a body of six thousand men, and to go and fight at their head (1631) under the banners of Gustavus Adolphus,² not foreseeing he would there imbibe the principles and creed of the very puritans, whom the church of England proscribed. Charles's faith in the reformed religion, such as Henry VIII. and Elizabeth had made it, was sincere; and yet, whether from tenderness to his wife, or from a spirit of moderation and justice, or from an instinct of what suited absolute power, he often granted to the catholics, not only a liberty at that time illegal, but almost avowed favour.³ Archbishop Laud, as sincere as his master, wrote against the court of Rome, even preached strongly against the worship conducted in the queen's chapel, yet at the same time he showed himself so favourable to the system of the Romish church, that the pope thought himself authorized to offer him a cardinal's hat, (Aug. 1633.) In the conduct of civil affairs, there reigned the same indecision, the same inconsistency. No broad, clear plan was perceptible; no powerful hand made itself uniformly felt. Despotism was pompously displayed, and, on occasion, exercised with rigour; but to give it a fixed basis, required too many efforts, too much perseverance; it came, by degrees, to be left quite out of mind, so that its abstract pretensions daily more and more exceeded its means. The treasury was administered with order and probity; the king was not wasteful; yet the want of money was just as great as could have been brought about by the grossest prodigality on the part of the prince, and the worst peculation on the part of his officers; in the same way that Charles had haughtily refused to yield to

¹ Neal's History of the Puritans, 1822; ii. 234

² Clarendon, i. 254.

³ Laud's Diary, p. 40; Whitelocke's, 18.

parliament, to obtain from it an income sufficient for his expenses, he now thought he should lower himself, by reducing his expenses, to a level with his income.¹ Splendour about the throne, court festivals, the old customs of the crown, were in his eyes conditions, rights, almost duties of royalty; sometimes he was ignorant of the abuses put in practice to provide for these, and when he did know, he had not the courage to reform them. Thus, though relieved by peace from all extraordinary expenditure, he found himself unable to meet the wants of his government. English commerce was prospering; the mercantile marine, daily growing more numerous and more active, solicited the protection of the royal navy. Charles confidently promised it, and even made, from time to time, serious efforts to keep his word;² but, as a general rule, the merchant fleets were without convoy, for the king's vessels wanted rigging, and the sailors were unpaid. The pirates of Barbary came to the British channel, to the very straits of Dover; they infested the shores of Great Britain, landed, pillaged the villages, and carried off thousands of captives (1637). Captain Rainsborough, who was at length sent to the coast of Morocco to destroy one of their haunts, found there three hundred and seventy slaves, English and Irish; and such was the weakness or the improvidence of the administration, that Strafford was obliged to arm a ship at his own expense to preserve the very port of Dublin from the ravages of these pirates.³

So much incapacity, and its inevitable perils, did not escape the observation of experienced men. The foreign ministers who resided in London wrote word of it to their masters; and soon, notwithstanding the known prosperity of England, it became a common topic on the continent that the government of Charles was feeble, imprudent, insecure. At Paris, at Madrid, at the Hague, his ambassadors were more than

¹ The pensions, which, under the reign of Elizabeth, were 18,000*l.*, rose, under James I., to 80,000*l.*; and, in 1626, a little more than a year after the accession of Charles I., they already amounted to 120,000*l.* The expenses of the king's household, in the same interval, had increased from 45,000*l.* to 80,000*l.*; that of the wardrobe had doubled; that of the privy purse, tripled, &c.—Rushworth, i. 207.

² Warwick's Memoirs; Rushworth, i. 2, 257, &c.

³ Strafford's Letters, i. 68; ii. 86, &c.; Waller's Poems, (1730), 271.

once treated slightly—nay, with contempt.¹ Strafford, Laud, and some others of the council, were not ignorant of the evil, and sought some remedy for it. Strafford, especially, the boldest as well as the most able, struggled passionately against all obstacles; he became anxious for the future, and would have had the king, governing his affairs with diligence and foresight, assure to himself a fixed revenue, well-stored arsenals, fortified places, and an army.² He, for his own part, had not hesitated to assemble the Irish parliament (1634), and, either through the fear he inspired, or the services he had rendered the country, he had made it the most docile as well as the most useful instrument of his power. But Charles forbade him to call it again;³ the queen and he dreaded the very name of parliament, and the fears of his master did not permit Strafford to give to tyranny the forms and support of the law. He urged the point for a time, but without success, and at last submitted. Energetic himself, he underwent the yoke of weakness; and his foresight was of no avail, for he spoke to the blind. Some of the council, who thought as he did, but were more selfish, or better aware of the futility of any efforts, withdrew, when, to support his views, a struggle was needed, leaving him alone with Laud, exposed to the intrigues and hatred of the court.

Tyranny, thus frivolous and unskilful, daily needs some new tyranny to carry it on. That of Charles was, if not the most cruel, at least the most unjust, the most chargeable with abuse that England had ever endured. Without being able to allege in excuse any public necessity, without dazzling men's minds by any great result, to satisfy obscure wants, to gratify fantastic and unmeaning whims, he set aside and outraged ancient rights equally with the

The writings of the time, among others the letters collected by Howell, present a thousand examples of this: I shall only cite one. When sir Thomas Edmonds went to France, in 1620, to conclude the treaty of peace, the gentleman sent to meet him to St. Denis, and preside at his entrance, said to him, with a sneer, "Your Excellency will not be astonished I have so few gentlemen with me, to pay you honour and accompany you to court; there were so many killed in the isle of Rè;" a bitter allusion to the terrible defeat of the English at that island, under the orders of the Duke of Buckingham.—Howell's Letters, (1705,) 210.

¹ Strafford's Letters, ii. 61, 62, 66.

² Ib. i. 303.

new-born wishes of the people, making no account either of the laws and opinions of the country, or of his own promises, assaying altogether hap-hazard, according to circumstances, every species of oppression; adopting, in short, the most rash resolutions, the most illegal measures, not to secure the triumph of a consistent and formidable system, but to maintain by daily expedients a power ever in embarrassment. Subtle lawyers, set to work rummaging among old records to discover a precedent for some forgotten iniquity, laboriously brought to light the abuses of past times, and erected them into rights of the throne. Thereupon, other agents, not so learned, but more actively daring, converted these pretended rights into real and new vexations; and if any appeal was made, servile judges were ready to declare that, in point of fact, the crown had of old possessed such prerogatives. Was the acquiescence of the judges at all matter of doubt—was it thought necessary not to put their influence too strongly to the test, the irregular tribunals, the star chamber, the council of the north,¹ and a number of other jurisdictions, independent of the common law, were charged to take their place, and the aid of illegal magistrates was called in when the severity of legal magistrates did not suffice for the purposes of tyranny. Thus were re-established imposts long fallen into desuetude, and others invented till then unknown; thus re-appeared those innumerable monopolies, introduced and abandoned by Elizabeth, recalled and abandoned by James I., constantly disallowed by parliament, and at one time abolished by Charles himself, and which, giving to contractors or to privileged courtiers the exclusive sale of almost all commodities, inflicted suffering upon the people, and irritated them still more by the unjust and most irregular subdivision of their profits.² The extension of the royal forests, that abuse which

¹ Instituted by Henry VIII. at York, in 1537, after the troubles which broke out in the northern counties, in consequence of the suppression of the lesser monasteries, to administer justice and maintain order in these counties, independently of the courts at Westminster. The jurisdiction of the court, at first very limited, became more extended and arbitrary under James I. and Charles I.

² The following is a list, though an incomplete one, of the wares then made monopolies of: salt, soap, coals, iron, wine, leather, starch, feathers, cards and dice, beaver, lace, tobacco, barrels, beer, distilled liquors, the

had often driven the barons of old in England to arms, became so great, that the forest of Rockingham alone was increased from six to sixty miles in circuit, while, at the same time, they hunted out, and punished by exorbitant fines,¹ the least encroachment on the part of the subject. Commissioners went about the country questioning here the rights of the possessors of former domains of the crown; there the rate of emoluments attached to certain offices, elsewhere the right of citizens to build new houses, or that of agriculturists to change their arable land into pasture, and they proceeded, whenever they could make out a case at all, not to reform abuses, but to sell their continuation at a high price.² Privileges, irregularities of all kinds, were, between the king and those who made a business of them, a compact subject of disgraceful bargains. They even turned into a commodity the severity of the judges; under the least pretext, unheard-of fines were imposed, which, striking terror into those who apprehended a similar visitation, determined them to secure themselves beforehand by a handsome bribe. It really seemed as though the tribunals had no other business than to provide for the wants of the king, or to ruin the adversaries of his power.³ If discontent in any particular county appeared too general for such proceedings to be easily practicable, the provincial militia was disarmed, and royal troops were sent there, whom the inhabitants were bound, not only to board and lodge, but moreover to equip. For not paying that which they did not owe, men were put in prison; they were released on paying a portion of the amount, more or less, according to their fortune, credit, or management. Imposts, imprisonments, judgments, rigours, or favours, everything was matter of arbitrary rule; and arbitrary rule extended itself daily more and more over the rich, because there was money to be got from them, over the

weighing of hay and straw in London and Westminster, red herrings, butter, potash, linen cloth, paper rags, hops, buttons, catgut, spectacles, combs, saltpetre, gunpowder, &c.

¹ Lord Salisbury was condemned to be fined, on this ground, 20,000*l.* lord Westmoreland, 12,000*l.*; sir Christopher Hatton, 12,000*l.*; lord Newport, 3000*l.*; sir Lewis Watson, 4000*l.*, &c.; Strafford's Letters, ii. 117. Parl. Hist. ii. 642.

² May, i. 17; Rushworth, ii. 2, 915.

³ The sum total of the fines imposed during this epoch for the king's profit, amounted to more than six millions of money. See Appendix IV

poor, because they were not to be feared. At last, when complaints grew so loud that the court took alarm, the magistrates who had given cause for them purchased impunity in their turn. In an access of insane despotism, for speaking a few inconsiderate words, Strafford had caused Lord Mountnorris to be condemned to death; and, though the sentence had not been carried into effect, the mere statement of the prosecution had raised against the deputy in Ireland, in England, even in the king's council, loud reprobation. To appease it, Strafford sent to London six thousand pounds, to be distributed among the principal councillors. "I fell upon the right way," answered lord Cottington, an old and crafty courtier, to whom he had entrusted the affair, "which was to give the money to him that really could do the business, which was the king himself;" and Strafford obtained at this price, not only exemption from all consequences, but the permission to distribute, at his own pleasure among his favourites, the spoils of the man whom, at his own pleasure, he had caused to be condemned.¹

Such was the effect of Charles's necessities: his fears carried him even much further than his necessities. Notwithstanding his haughty indifference, he at times felt his weakness and sought for support. He made some attempts to restore to the higher aristocracy the strength it no longer enjoyed. Under the pretence of preventing prodigality, country gentlemen were ordered to live on their estates; their influence was feared in London.² The star-chamber took under its care the consideration due to the nobility. A want of respect, an inadvertency, a joke, the least action which seemed not to keep in just recognition the superiority of their rank and of their rights, was punished with extreme rigour, and always by enormous fines for the benefit of the king and the offended party.³ The aim was to make the court people

¹ Strafford's Letters, i. 511.

² More than two hundred gentlemen were proceeded against in one day (March 20, 1635), and by the same indictment, for having disobeyed this injunction. Rushworth, i. 2, 288.

³ A person named Grenville was condemned to pay the king 4000*l.* and as much in damages to lord Suffolk, for having said of the latter that he was a base lord; Pettager was fined 2000*l.*, and ordered to be flogged, for having used the same term in reference to the earl of Kingston. Rushworth, ii. 2. Append. 43, 72.

powerful and respected; but these attempts were not followed up, either because their futility was soon ascertained, or because the history of the barons of old had the effect of inspiring the king with some distrust of their descendants. In point of fact, some of them were foremost in the ranks of the malcontents, and only these had any credit among the people at large. The court still succeeded, on occasions, in humiliating private gentlemen before the lords of the court; but it became clearly necessary to seek elsewhere a body, who, already powerful in themselves, still stood in need of aid from the crown, and might, by being admitted to a share of absolute power, contribute in return to its support. For a long time past the English clergy had solicited this mission; they were now called to fulfil it.

Emanating in its origin from the sole will of the temporal sovereign, the Anglican church had, as has been seen, thence lost all independence; it had no longer a divine mission, it subsisted no longer of its own right. Standing apart from the people, who did not elect them, separated from the pope and the universal church, formerly their support, the bishops and the superior clergy, were mere delegates of the prince, his chief servants: an altogether false position for a body charged to represent that which is most independent and elevated in the nature of man—faith. The English church had early perceived this defect in its constitution; but its many perils, and fear of the strong hand of Henry VIII. and of Elizabeth, had prevented it from taking any steps to retrieve its position. Assailed at once by the catholics and the non-conformists, its possessions and its faith still alike precarious, it devoted itself unreservedly to the service of temporal power, acknowledging its own dependence, and admitting the absolute supremacy of the throne, which, at that time, could alone save it from its enemies.

Towards the end of the reign of Elizabeth, some few indications manifested themselves, here and there, on the part of the Anglican clergy, of rather loftier pretensions. Dr. Bancroft, chaplain to the archbishop of Canterbury, maintained that episcopacy was not a human institution, that it had been, from the time of the apostles, the government of the church, and that bishops held their rights, not from the temporal sove-

reign, but from God alone¹. This new clergy, in fact, had begun to think its power more firmly based, and took a first step towards independence; but the attempt, ventured timidly, was haughtily repulsed. Elizabeth asserted the plenitude of her spiritual supremacy, emphatically repeating to the bishops that they were nothing but by her will; and the archbishop of Canterbury contented himself with saying he wished the doctor was right, but he did not dare flatter himself he was.² The people energetically sided with the queen; their only thought was to advance reform, and they perfectly well understood that if the bishops aspired to independence, it was not to free faith from temporal authority, but to oppress it on their own account.

Nothing decisive was done under James I.; selfish and cunning, he cared little about aggravating the evil, provided he kept clear of the peril. He maintained his supremacy, but granted so much favour to the bishops, took so much care to strengthen their power, by harsh treatment of their enemies, that their confidence and strength daily augmented. Zealous in proclaiming the divine right of the throne, they soon began to speak of their own; that which Bancroft had timidly insinuated, became an opinion openly avowed by all the upper clergy, supported in numerous writings, asserted from the very pulpit. Bancroft himself was created archbishop of Canterbury, (Dec. 1604.) Every time that the king made a parade of his prerogative, the clergy bowed with respect; but immediately after these acts of momentary humility, resumed their pretensions, putting them forward, more especially as against the people, the better to conciliate the king, devoting themselves more and more to the cause of absolute monarchy, and looking forward to the day when they should be so necessary to it, that it would be compelled to acknowledge their independence to make sure of their aid.

When Charles, having quarrelled with his parliament, stood alone in the midst of his kingdom, seeking on all sides the means of governing, the Anglican clergy believed this day was come. They had again got immense wealth, and enjoyed it without dispute. The papists no longer inspired them with alarm. The primate of the church, Laud, possessed the entire con-

¹ In a sermon, preached 12th Jan. 1588.—Neal, i. 395.

² Ib. i. 392.

fidence of the king, and alone directed all ecclesiastical affairs. Among the other ministers, none professed, like lord Burleigh under Elizabeth, to fear and struggle against the encroachments of the clergy. The courtiers were indifferent, or secret papists. Learned men threw lustre over the church. The universities, that of Oxford more especially, were devoted to her maxims. Only one adversary remained—the people, each day more discontented with uncompleted reform, and more eager fully to accomplish it. But this adversary was also the adversary of the throne; it claimed at the same time, the one to secure the other, evangelical faith and civil liberty. The same peril threatened the sovereignty of the crown and of episcopacy. The king, sincerely pious, seemed disposed to believe that he was not the only one who held his authority from God, and that the power of the bishops was neither of less high origin, nor of less sacred character. Never had so many favourable circumstances seemed combined to enable the clergy to achieve independence of the crown, dominion over the people.

Laud set himself to work with his accustomed vehemence. First it was essential that all dissensions in the bosom of the church itself should cease, and that the strictest uniformity should infuse strength into its doctrines, its discipline, its worship. He applied himself to this task with the most unhesitating and unscrupulous resolution. Power was exclusively concentrated into the hands of the bishops. The court of high commission, where they took cognizance of and decided everything relating to religious matters, became day by day more arbitrary, more harsh in its jurisdiction, its forms, and its penalties. The complete adoption of the Anglican canons, the minute observance of the liturgy, and the rites enforced in cathedrals, were rigorously exacted on the part of the whole ecclesiastical body. A great many livings were in the hands of nonconformists; they were withdrawn from them. The people crowded to their sermons; they were forbidden to preach.¹ Driven from their churches, deprived of their incomes, they travelled from town to town, teaching and preaching to the faithful who, in a tavern, private house, or field, would gather round them;

persecution followed and reached them everywhere. In the country, noblemen, retired citizens, rich homes devoted to their faith, received them into their homes as chaplains or as tutors for their children; persecution penetrated even here, and drove forth the chosen chaplains and tutors.¹ These proscribed men quitted England; they went to France, Holland, Germany, to found churches in accordance with their faith; despotism pursued them beyond seas, and summoned these churches to conform to the Anglican rites.² French, Dutch, German mechanics had brought their industry into England, and obtained charters which assured to them the free exercise of their national religion; these charters were withdrawn from them, and most of them abandoned their adopted country; the diocese of Norwich alone lost three thousand of these hard-working foreigners.³ Thus deprived of every asylum, of all employment, fugitives or concealed, the nonconformists still wrote in defence and in propagation of their doctrines; the censor prohibited these new books, and sought out and suppressed the old.⁴ It was even absolutely forbidden to touch, either in the pulpit or elsewhere, upon the questions with which men's minds were most agitated;⁵ for the controversy was general and profound, upon dogmas as upon discipline, on the mysteries of human destiny as on the proper forms of public worship; and the Anglican church would neither tolerate departure from its ceremonies, nor admit discussion of its opinions. The people grieved to hear no longer either the men they loved, or the topics that occupied their thoughts. To calm their alarms, to prevent being entirely separated from their flock, moderate or timid nonconformist ministers offered partial submission, claiming in return some partial concessions, such as the not wearing a surplice, the not giving to the communion table the form or position of an altar, and so on. They were answered, either that the form in question was so important that they must not depart from it, or that it was so unimportant, as not to be worth their opposing it. Driven to extremity, they determinately resisted, and insult as well as condemnation

¹ Neal, ii. 179, etc.

² Ib. 205.

³ Rushworth, i. 2, 27C; May, i. 83; Neal, ii. 232.

⁴ Decree of the star-chamber, July 11, 1637; Rushworth, ii. 2, appendix, 806; Neal, ii. 165.

⁵ Ib. ii. 163.

awaited them in the ecclesiastical courts. The bishops and judges, and their officers, thee-and-thoued them in the most insolent manner; called them all sorts of fools, idiots, rascally knaves, and habitually ordered them to be silent the moment they opened their mouths to defend themselves, or explain anything.¹ Even if they renounced preaching, writing, or appearing in public at all, tyranny did not renounce its persecution; its malevolence was characterized by an ingenuity, a tenacity of oppression, which no prudence on the part of the wretched men could foresee, no humility turn aside. Mr. Workman, a minister at Gloucester, had asserted that pictures and ornaments in churches were a relic of idolatry; he was thrown into prison. A short time before, the town of Gloucester had made him a grant of twenty pounds a year for life; it was ordered to cease, and the mayor and municipal officers were prosecuted and fined a large sum for having made it. On quitting his prison, Workman opened a little school; Laud ordered it to be closed. To earn a living, the poor minister turned doctor; Laud interdicted his medicining as he had interdicted his teaching: hereupon Workman went mad, and soon after died.²

Meantime, the pomp of catholic worship speedily took possession of the churches deprived of their pastors; while persecution kept away the faithful, magnificence adorned the walls. They were consecrated amid great display,³ and it was then necessary to employ force to collect a congregation. Laud was fond of prescribing minutely the details of new ceremonies—sometimes borrowed from Rome, sometimes the product of his own imagination, at once ostentatious and austere. On the part of the nonconformists, every innovation, the least derogation from the canons or the liturgy, was punished as a crime; yet Laud innovated without consulting anybody, looking to nothing beyond the king's consent, and sometimes acting entirely upon his own authority.⁴ He altered the interior arrangement of churches, the forms of worship, imperiously prescribed practices till then unknown, even altered the liturgy which parliaments had sanctioned; and all these changes had, if not the aim, at all events the result of rendering

¹ Rushworth, i. 2, 233, 240; Neal, i. 256, in the note, p. 352.

² Neal, ii. 204.

³ Ib. 100.

⁴ Ib. 220.

the Anglican church more and more like that of Rome. The liberty the papists enjoyed, and the hopes they displayed, whether from imprudence or design, confirmed the people in their worst apprehensions. Books were published to prove that the doctrine of the English bishops might very well adapt itself to that of Rome; and these books, though not regularly licensed, were dedicated to the king or to Laud, and openly tolerated.¹ Many theologians, friends of Laud, such as bishop Montague, Dr. Cosens, professed similar maxims, and professed them with entire impunity, while preachers whom the people loved, in vain exhausted compliance and courage to retain some right to preach and write. Accordingly, the belief in the speedy triumph of popery grew daily more strong, and the courtiers, who were nearer the scene of action, fully shared this belief with the people. The duke of Devonshire's daughter turned catholic; Laud asked her what reasons had determined her to this? "I hate to be in a crowd," said she; "and as I perceive your grace and many others are hastening towards Rome, I want to get there comfortably by myself before you."

The splendour and exclusive dominion of episcopacy thus established, at least so he flattered himself, Laud proceeded to secure its independence. One might have thought that in this desire he would have found the king less docile to his counsels; but it was quite otherwise. The divine right of bishops became, in a short time, the official doctrine, not only of the upper clergy, but of the king himself. Dr. Hall, bishop of Exeter, set it forth in a treatise which Laud took care to revise, and from which he struck out every vague or timid sentence, every appearance of doubt or concession.² From books, this doctrine soon passed into acts. The bishops held their ecclesiastical courts no longer in the name and by virtue of delegation from the king, but in their own name; the episcopal seal alone was affixed to their acts; it was declared that the superintendence of the universities belonged of right to the metropolitan.³ The supremacy of the prince was not formally abolished, but it might be said only to remain as a veil to the usurpations that were to destroy it. Thus throwing off, by degrees, all temporal restraint, on the one hand, the

¹ Whitelocke, p. 22.

² Neal, ii. 292.

³ Ib. 243; Whitelocke, *ut sup.*

church, on the other, encroached upon civil affairs; her jurisdiction extended itself at the expense of the ordinary tribunals, and never had so many ecclesiastics held seats in the king's council, or occupied the high offices of state. At times, the lawyers, finding their personal interests threatened, rose against these encroachments; but Charles gave no heed to them; and such was the confidence felt by Laud, that when he had caused the wand of high treasurer to be given to bishop Juxon, he exclaimed, in the transport of his joy, "Now let the church subsist and sustain her own power herself;—all is accomplished for her: I can do no more."¹

By the time things had come to this pass, the people were not alone in their anger. The high nobility, part of them at least, took the alarm.² They saw in the progress of the church far more than mere tyranny; it was a regular revolution, which, not satisfied with crushing popular reforms, disfigured and endangered the first reformation; that which kings had made and the aristocracy adopted. The latter had learned to proclaim the supremacy and divine right of the throne, which, at least, freed them from any other empire; now they had severally to acknowledge the divine right of bishops, and to bow down, in their turn, before that church whose humiliation they had admiringly sanctioned, in whose spoils they had shared. From them was required servility, still more jealous of its prerogatives than liberty of its rights; yet others, heretofore their inferiors, were permitted to assume independence. They felt their rank, nay, perhaps their property, in danger. Haughtiness on the part of the clergy, was an annoyance to which they had now been long unaccustomed; they heard people say, that the day would soon come when a simple ecclesiastic would be as great a personage as the proudest gentleman in the land;³ they saw the bishops or their creatures carry off well nigh all public offices, well nigh all the favours of the crown, the only compensation remaining to the nobles for the loss of their ancient splendour, their liberties, and their power. Charles, besides being sincere in his devotion to the clergy, promised himself in their exaltation a strong support against the ill-will of

¹ Laud's Diary, under the date of the 6th of March, 1636.

² Neal, ii. 250.

³ Ib. ii. 251.

the people; and, altogether, the disposition to censure the conduct and to suspect the designs of government, soon became universal; discontent spread from the workshops of the city to the saloons of Whitehall.

Among the higher classes, it manifested itself in a distaste for the court, and a freedom of mind hitherto unknown. Several of the higher nobility, the most esteemed by the country, retired to their estates, in order to show their disapprobation by their absence. In London and about the throne, the spirit of independence and investigation penetrated into assemblies before utterly servile or frivolous. Since the reign of Elizabeth, a taste for sciences and literature had no longer been the exclusive privilege of their professors; the society of distinguished men, philosophers, scholars, poets, artists, and the pleasures of learned and literary conversation, had been sought by the court as a new source of display, in other quarters, as a noble pastime; but no need of opposition mixed itself up with the spirit of these associations; it was even the fashion, whether they were held in some famous tavern, or in the mansion of some lord, to ridicule the morose humour and fanatic resistance of the religious nonconformists, already known under the appellation of puritans. Fêtes, plays, literary conversation, an agreeable interchange of flatteries and favours, were all that entered into the aim of a society, of which the throne was usually the centre and always the protector. It was no longer thus in the reign of Charles; men of letters and men of the world continued to meet together; but they discussed much graver questions, and discussed them apart from the observation of power, which would have taken offence at them. Public affairs, the moral sciences, religious problems, were the topics of their conversations, which were brilliant and animated, and eagerly sought by young men returned from their travels, or who were studying law in the Temple, and by all the other men of a serious and active mind whose rank and fortune gave them the opportunity. Here Selden poured out the treasures of his erudition; Chillingworth discoursed of his doubts on matters of faith; lord Falkland, then quite young, threw open his house for their meetings, and his gardens were compared to those of the Academy.¹

¹ Clarendon's Memoirs, (1827.) i. 55.

There neither sects nor parties were formed, but free and vigorous opinions. Unshackled by selfish interests or projects, drawn together solely by the pleasure of exchanging ideas, and stimulating each other to generous sentiments, the men who took part in these meetings debated without constraint, and each sought only truth and justice. Some, more particularly applying themselves to philosophical meditation, inquired what form of government most suited the dignity of man: others, lawyers by profession, allowed no illegal act of the king or his council to pass unnoticed; others, theologians by calling or taste, narrowly investigated the first ages of Christianity, their creeds, their forms of worship, and compared them with the church which Laud was essaying to establish. These men were not united by common passions and perils, nor by any definite principles or object; but they all agreed and mutually excited each other to detest tyranny, to despise the court, to regret the parliament, to desire, in short, a reform which they had slight hope of, but in which each, in the freedom of his thought, promised himself the termination of his sorrows, the accomplishment of all his wishes.

Further from court, with men of an inferior class and inferior refinement of mind, the feeling was of a severer character, and the ideas though narrower more determined. Here opinions were connected with interest, passions with opinions. With the gentry, it was more particularly against political tyranny that anger was directed. The decay of the higher aristocracy, and of the feudal system, had greatly weakened the distinctions of rank among the inferior classes: all gentlemen at this time regarded themselves as the descendants of those who had achieved Magna Charta; and were indignant at seeing their rights, their persons, their possessions subject to the good will and pleasure of the king and his councillors, while their ancestors, as they constantly reminded one another, had of old made war upon the sovereign, and dictated laws. No philosophical theory, no learned distinction between democracy, aristocracy, and royalty, occupied them; the house of commons alone filled their thoughts: that represented, in their eyes, the nobles as well as the people, the ancient coalition of the barons as well as the nation at large: that alone had of late years defended public liberty, that alone was capable of regaining it; that alone was thought

of, when parliament was mentioned; and the lawfulness as well as the necessity of its being all-powerful was an idea that by degrees established itself in every mind. With respect to the church, most of the gentry were, as to its form of government, without any particular view, and assuredly without any idea of destroying it. They had no hostility to episcopacy; but the bishops were odious to them as the abettors and upholders of tyranny. The reformation had proclaimed the enfranchisement of civil society, and abolished the usurpations of spiritual power in temporal matters. The Anglican clergy sought to resume the power which Rome had lost: that this ambition might be repressed, that the pope should have no successors in England, that the bishops, keeping apart from the government of the state, should limit themselves to administering, according to the laws of the land, the affairs of religion in their respective dioceses, this was the general wish and feeling of the country nobility and gentry, who were all well enough disposed to sanction an episcopal constitution, provided the church neither pretended to political power nor to divine right.

In the towns, the better class of citizens, in the country, a large proportion of the lesser gentry, and almost all the freeholders, carried their views, extended their indignation, particularly in religious matters, much further than this. With them predominated a passionate attachment to the cause of reform, an ardent desire to have its great principles thoroughly worked out, a profound hatred of everything that retained any semblance to popery, or recalled it to their memory. It was under the usurpations of the Roman hierarchy, said they, that the primitive church, the simplicity of its worship, the purity of its faith, were destroyed. Therefore was it, they went on, that the first church of reform, the new apostles, Zwinglius, Calvin, Knox, applied themselves promptly and vigorously to abolish this tyrannical constitution and its idolatrous pomps. The gospel had been their rule, the primitive church their model. England alone persisted in walking in the ways of popery: for was the yoke of the bishops less hard, their conduct more evangelical, their pride less arrogant than that of Rome? Like Rome, they only thought of power and riches; like Rome, they disliked frequent preaching, austerity of manners, freedom of prayer;

like Rome, they claimed to subject to immutable and minute forms the impulses of Christian souls; like Rome, they substituted, for the vivifying words of Christ, the worldly pageantry of their ceremonies. On the sacred day of the sabbath did true Christians desire to perform, in the retirement of their homes, their pious exercises? in every square, in every street, the noise of games and dancing; the riots of drunkenness insultingly broke in upon their meditations. And the bishops were not satisfied with permitting these profane pastimes: they recommended—nay, almost commanded them, lest the people should acquire a taste for more holy pleasures.¹ Was there in their flock a man whose timorous conscience felt wounded by some usages of the church? they imperiously imposed upon him the observance of its minutest laws; if they saw another attached to the laws, they tormented him with their innovations; they crushed the humble; the high-souled, they irritated to revolt. On all sides were maintained the maxims, usages, and pretensions of the enemies of the true faith. And why this abandonment of the gospel? this oppression of the most zealous Christians? To maintain a power which the gospel conferred on no one, which the first believers had never known. It was desired that episcopacy should be abolished, that the church, becoming once more itself, its own, should be henceforth governed by ministers equal among themselves, simple preachers of the gospel, and regulating in concert, in common deliberation, the discipline of the Christian people; this would be indeed the church of Christ; then there would no longer be idolatry, or tyranny; and the reformation, at last accomplished, would no longer have to fear popery, even now at the door, ready to invade the house of God, which its keepers seem getting ready for the reception of the enemy.²

When the people, among whom, from the first rise of the reformation, these ideas had been obscurely fermenting, saw them adopted by a number of rich, eminent, and influential men, their own direct and natural supporters, they acquired a confidence in them and in themselves, which, though it did not then break out into sedition, soon changed the whole condition and aspect of the country. Already in 1582 and 1616; a few nonconformists, formally separating from the

¹ Neal, ii. 212; Rushworth, i. 2. 101.

² Rushworth, i. 3, 172.

church of England, had formed, under the name, afterwards so celebrated, of *Brownists* and *Independents*, little dissenting sects, who rejected all general government of the church, and proclaimed the right of every congregation of the faithful to regulate its own worship upon purely republican principles.¹ From that epoch, some private congregations had been established on this model, but they were few in number, poor, and almost all as strange to the nation as to the church. Exposed, without the means of defence, to persecution as soon as it had ferreted them out, the sectaries fled, and generally retired to Holland. But soon love for their country struggled in their hearts, with the desire for liberty; to conciliate both, they sent messages to the friends whom they had left behind, concerting with them to go together in search of a new country, in some scarcely known region, but which at least belonged to England and where English people only were to be found. The more wealthy sold their property, bought a small vessel, provisions, implements of husbandry, and, under the charge of a minister of their faith, went to join their friends in Holland, thence to proceed together to North America, where some efforts at colonization were then making. It seldom happened that the vessel was large enough to take all the passengers who wished to go; on such occasions, all being assembled on the sea side, at the place off which the ship lay at anchor, there, on the beach, the minister of that part of the congregation which was to remain behind, preached a farewell sermon; the minister of those who were about to depart answered him by another sermon. Long did they pray together ere they exchanged a parting embrace; and then, as the one party sailed away, the other returned sorrowfully, to await amid a strange people, the opportunity and means of rejoining their brethren.² Several expeditions of this kind took place successively and without obstacle, owing to the obscurity of the fugitives. But all at once, in 1637, the king perceived that they had become numerous and frequent, that considerable citizens engaged in them, that they carried away with them great riches; already, it was said, more than twelve millions of property had thus been lost to the country.³ It was no longer merely a few

¹ Neal, i. 301 : ii. 43, 92.

² Ib. ii. 110.

³ Ib. 186.

weak and obscure sectarians who felt the weight of tyranny; their opinions had spread, and their feelings were shared, even by the classes which did not adopt their opinions. In various ways, the government had rendered itself so odious, that thousands of men, differing in rank and fortune and objects, severed themselves from their native land. An order of the council forbade these emigrations, (May 1, 1637.)¹ At that very time, eight vessels, ready to depart, were at anchor in the Thames: on board one of them were *Pym, Haslerig, Hampden, and Cromwell.*²

They were wrong to fly from tyranny, for the people began to brave it. Fermentation had succeeded to discontent. It was no longer merely the re-establishment of legal order, nor even the abolition of episcopacy, that men's thoughts limited themselves to. In the shadow of the great party which meditated this double reform, a number of more ardent, more daring sects were growing up. On all sides, small congregations detached themselves from the church, taking as their symbol some such or such interpretation of a dogma; some the rejection of such or such a rite; some the destruction of all ecclesiastical government, the absolute independence of the faithful, and the having recourse alone to the inspiration of the Holy Spirit. Everywhere passion mastered fear. Notwithstanding the active inquisition of Laud, sects of all descriptions assembled, in towns, in some cellar; in the country, under the roof of a barn, or in the midst of a wood. The dismal character of the locality, their perils and difficulties in meeting, all excited the imagination of preachers and hearers; they passed together long hours, often whole nights, praying, singing hymns, seeking the Lord, and cursing their enemies. Of little import to the safety or even to the credit of these fanatic associations was the senselessness of their doctrines, or the small number of their partisans; they were sheltered and protected by the general resentment that had taken possession of the country. In a short time, whatever their appellation, their creed, or their designs, the confidence of the nonconformists in public favour became so great, that they did not hesitate to distinguish themselves by their dress and their

¹ Rushworth, i. 2, 400.

* Neel, ii, 237. Walpole, Catalogue of Royal and Noble Authors, (1788), i. 206.

manners, thus professing their opinions before the very eyes of their persecutors. Clothed in black, the hair cut close, the head covered with a high-crowned, wide-brimmed hat, they were everywhere objects of respect to the multitude, who gave them the name of saints. Their credit augmented to such a degree, that notwithstanding the persecution which followed them, even hypocrisy declared on their side. Bankrupt merchants, workmen without employment, men rendered outcasts by debauchery and debts, whoever needed to raise his character in the estimation of the public, assumed the dress, air, and language of the saints, and at once obtained, from a passionate credulity, welcome and protection.¹ In political matters the effervescence, though less general, less disorderly, daily extended. Among the inferior classes, the effect either of their bettered means, or of religious opinions, ideas and desires of equality, till then unknown, began to circulate. In a more elevated sphere, some proud and rugged minds, detesting the court, despising the impotency of the ancient laws, and giving themselves up passionately to their soaring thoughts, dreamed, in the solitude of their reading, or the secrecy of their private conversations, of more simple and efficacious institutions. Others, influenced by aims less pure, indifferent to all creeds, profligate in their manners, and thrown by their humour or by chance among the discontented, desired an anarchy which would make way for their ambition, or at all events free them from all restraint. Fanaticism and licentiousness, sincerity and hypocrisy, respect and contempt for old institutions, legitimate wishes, and disorderly aspirations—all these concurred to foment the national anger; all rallied together against a power whose tyranny inspired with the same hatred men of the most various feelings and views, while its imprudence and weakness gave activity and hope to the meanest factions, to the most daring dreams.

For some time this progress of public indignation passed unperceived by the king and his council; apart, as it were, from the nation, and meeting with no effectual resistance, the government, notwithstanding its embarrassments, was still confident and haughty. To justify its conduct, it often spoke,

¹ Mrs. Hutchinson's Memoirs.

and with marked emphasis, of the bad spirit that was abroad; but its momentary doubts did not awaken its prudence; while it feared, it despised its enemies. Even the necessity of making, day after day, its oppression still more and more oppressive, did not enlighten it; nay, with an imbecile pride, it regarded as manifestations of power the additional rigour which the increasing peril obliged it to put in force.

In 1686, England was inundated with pamphlets against the favour shown to the papists, the disorders of the court, above all, against the tyranny of Laud and the bishops. Already more than once the star-chamber had severely punished such publications, but never before had they been so numerous, so violent, so diffused, so eagerly sought for as now. They were spread through every town, they found their way to the remotest villages; daring smugglers brought thousands of copies from Holland, realizing a large profit; they were commented on in the churches, which Laud had not been able entirely to clear of puritan preachers. Incensed at the inefficacy of its ordinary severities, the council resolved to try others. A lawyer, a theologian, and a physician, Prynne, Burton, and Bastwick, were brought at the same time before the star-chamber. The government at first wished to try them for high treason, which would have involved capital punishment; but the judges declared there were no means of straining the law so far, so that they were fain to content themselves with a charge of petty treason or felony.¹

The iniquity of the proceedings quite matched the barbarity of the sentence. The accused were summoned to make their defence forthwith, or that the allegations would be held as admitted. They answered they could not write it, for that paper, ink, and pen had been denied them. These were supplied, with an order to have their defence signed by a barrister; and yet for several days access to the prison was refused to the barrister they had selected. Admitted at last, he refused to sign the paper, fearing to compromise himself with the court; and no other counsel would undertake it. They asked permission to give in their defence signed by themselves. The court rejected the application, with the intimation that without a barrister's signature they should con-

¹ Rushworth, i. 2, 324

sider the imputed offences proved. "My lords," said Prynne, "you ask an impossibility." The court merely repeated its declaration. The trial opened with a gross insult to one of the prisoners. Four years before, for another pamphlet, Prynne had been condemned to have his ears cut off. "I had thought," said lord Finch, looking at him, "Mr. Prynne had no ears; but methinks he hath ears." This caused many of the lords to take a closer view of him; and for their better satisfaction the usher of the court turned up his hair and showed his ears, upon the sight whereof the lords were displeased they had been no more cut off, and reproached him. "I hope your honours will not be offended," said Prynne; "pray God give you ears to hear."¹

They were sentenced to the pillory, to lose their ears, to pay 5000*l.*, and to perpetual imprisonment. On the day of the sentence, (June 30,) an immense crowd pressed round the pillory; the executioner wanted to keep them off: "Let them come, and spare not," said Burton; "that they may learn to suffer;" the man was moved, and did not insist.² "Sir," said a woman to Burton, "by this sermon, God may convert many unto him." He answered, "God is able to do it, indeed!"³ A young man turned pale, as he looked at him: "Son, son," said Burton to him, "what is the matter, you look so pale? I have as much comfort as my heart can hold, and if I had need of more I should have it."⁴ The crowd pressed nearer and nearer round the condemned; some one gave Bastwick a bunch of flowers; a bee settled on it: "Do ye not see this poor bee," said he, "she hath found out this very place to suck sweet from these flowers; and cannot I suck sweetness in this very place from Christ."⁵ "Had we respected our liberties," said Prynne, "we had not stood here at this time; it was for the general good and liberties of you all that we have now thus far engaged our own liberties in this cause. For did you know how deeply they have encroached on your liberties, if you knew but into what times you are cast, it would make you look about, and see how far your liberty did lawfully extend, and so maintain it."⁶ The air rang with solemn acclamations.

State Trials, iii. 711.

⁴ Ib. 752.

⁵ Ib. 751.

⁶ Ib. 751.

Ib. 753.

⁶ Ib. 748.

Some months after, (April 18,) the same scenes were renewed around the scaffold where, for the same cause, Lilburne was undergoing a like cruel treatment. The enthusiasm of the sufferer and of the people seemed even still greater. Tied to a cart's tail and whipped through the streets of Westminster, Lilburne never ceased from exhorting the multitude that closely followed him. When bound to the pillory, he continued to speak; he was ordered to be silent, but in vain; they gagged him. He then drew from his pockets pamphlets, which he threw to the people, who seized them with avidity; his hands were then tied. Motionless and silent, the crowd who had heard him remained to gaze upon him. Some of his judges were at a window, as if curious to see how far his perseverance would go; he exhausted their curiosity.¹

As yet the martyrs had been only men of the people; none of them distinguished by name, talents, or fortune; most of them, indeed, before their trial, were of but little consideration in their profession; and the opinions they maintained were, chiefly, those of the fanatic sects, which were popular more especially with the multitude. Proud of their courage, the people soon charged the higher classes with weakness and apathy: "Honour," said they, "that did use to reside in the head, is now, like the gout, got into the foot."² But it was not so: the country nobles and gentlemen, and the higher class of citizens, were no less irritated than the people; but more clear-sighted and less enthusiastic, they waited for some great occasion giving well-grounded expectation of success. This public cry aroused them, and inspired them with confidence. The time had come when the nation, thoroughly excited, only needed known, steady, influential leaders, who would resist, not as adventurers or mere sectaries, but in the name of the rights and interests of the whole country.

A gentleman of Buckinghamshire, John Hampden, gave the signal for this national resistance. Before him, indeed, several had attempted it, but unsuccessfully; they, like him, had refused to pay the impost called *ship money*, requiring to have the question brought before the court of king's bench, and that they should be allowed, in a solemn

¹ State Trials, 1815, *et seq.*

² A saying related in a letter of Lord Haughton to Sir Thomas Wentworth, dated May 19th, 1627. Strafford's Letters and Despatches, i. 38.

trial, to maintain their opinion of the illegality of the tax, and the legality of their refusal to pay it; but the court had hitherto always found means to elude the discussion;¹ Hampden enforced it. Though in 1626 and 1628 he had sat in parliament on the benches of the opposition, he had not attracted any peculiar suspicion on the part of the court. Since the last dissolution, he had lived tranquilly, sometimes on his estates, sometimes travelling over England and Scotland, everywhere attentively observing the state of men's minds, and forming numerous connexions, but giving no utterance to his own feelings. Possessing a large fortune, he enjoyed it honourably, and without display; of grave and simple manners, but without any show of austerity, remarkable for his affability and the serenity of his temper; he was respected by all his neighbours, of whatever party, and passed among them for a sensible man, opposed to the prevalent system, but not fanatic nor factious. The magistrates of the county, accordingly, without fearing, spared him. In 1636, in their assessment, they rated Hampden at the trifling sum of twenty shillings, intending without doubt to let him off easy, and also hoping that the smallness of the rate would prevent a prudent man from disputing it. Hampden refused to pay it; but without passion, or noise; solely intent upon bringing to a solemn judicial decision, in his own person, the rights of his country. In prison, his conduct was equally quiet and reserved; he only required to be brought before the judges, and represented that the king was no less interested than himself in having such a question settled by the laws. The king, full of confidence, having recently obtained from the judges the declaration, that, in case of urgent necessity, and for the security of the kingdom, this tax might be legally imposed, was, at last, persuaded to allow Hampden the honour of fighting the case. Hampden's counsel managed the affair with the same prudence that he himself had shown, speaking of the king and his prerogative with profound respect, avoiding all declamation, all hazardous principles, resting solely on the laws and history of the country.² One of them, Mr. Holborne, even checked himself several times, begging the court to forgive him the warmth of his arguments, and to

¹ Rushworth, i. 2, 323, 414, &c

² Ib. i. 2, 352; State Trials, iii. 825.

warn him if he passed the limits which decorum and law prescribed. The crown lawyers, themselves, praised Mr. Hampden for his moderation. During the thirteen days the trial lasted, amid all the public irritation, the fundamental laws of the country were debated without the defenders of public liberty once laying themselves open to any charge of passion, any suspicion of seditious design.¹

Hampden was condemned (June 12), only four judges voting in his favour.² The king congratulated himself on this decision, as the decisive triumph of arbitrary power. The people took the same view of it, and no longer hoped aught from the magistrates or the laws. Charles had but small cause for rejoicing. The people, in losing hope, regained courage. Discontent, hitherto deficient in cohesion became unanimous: gentlemen, citizens, farmers, tradespeople, presbyterians, sectarians, the whole nation felt itself wounded by this decision.³ The name of Hampden was in every mouth, pronounced with tenderness and pride, for his destiny was the type of his conduct, his conduct the glory of the country. The friends and partisans of the court scarcely dared to maintain the legality of its victory. The judges excused themselves, almost confessing their cowardice, to obtain forgiveness. The more peaceful citizens were sorrowfully silent; the bolder spirits expressed their indignation aloud, with secret satisfaction. Soon, both in London and the provinces, the discontented found leaders who met to talk of the future. Everywhere measures were taken to concert with and uphold each other in case of necessity. In a word, a party was formed, carefully concealing itself as such, but publicly avowed by the nation. The king and his council were still rejoicing over their last triumph, when already their adversaries had found the occasion and the means to act.

About a month after Hampden's condemnation, (July 23,)

¹ State Trials, iii. 846—1254.

² Sir Humphry Davenport, sir John Denham, sir Richard Hutton, and sir George Croke. Contrary to the general assertion, Mr. Lingard says that five judges declared in favour of Hampden. Hist. of England, 1825, x. 38. His error evidently arises from his having reckoned for two voices, the two opinions given in favour of Hampden by Judge Croke, which are both inserted in the trial. (State Trials, iii. 1127—1181.) In 1645, the son of judge Hutton was killed at Sherborne for the royal cause.

³ May, *passim*. Hocket, Life of Bishop Williams, part 2, p. 127.

a violent sedition broke out at Edinburgh. It was excited by the arbitrary and sudden introduction of a new liturgy. Since his accession, after the example of his father, Charles had incessantly been endeavouring to overthrow the republican constitution which the Scottish church had borrowed from Calvinism, and to re-establish Scottish episcopacy, the outline of which still existed, in the plenitude of its authority and splendour. Fraud, violence, threats, corruption, everything had been essayed to procure success for this design. Despotism had even shown itself supple and patient; it had addressed itself sometimes to the ambition of the ecclesiastics, sometimes to the interest of the small landed proprietors, offering to the latter an easy redemption of their tithes, to the former high church dignities and honourable offices in the state, always advancing towards its object, yet contenting itself with a slow and tortuous progress. From time to time the people became more and more alarmed, and the national clergy resisted; its assemblies were then suspended, its boldest preachers banished. The parliament, generally servile, sometimes hesitated; the elections were then interfered with, their debates stifled, even their votes falsified.¹ The Scottish church, in the course of struggles wherein victory always declared for the crown, passed by degrees under the yoke of a hierarchy and discipline, nearly conformable with that of the English church, and which regarded as equally sacred the absolute power and the divine right of bishops and of the king. In 1636, the work seemed all but completed; the bishops had recovered their jurisdiction; the archbishop of St. Andrew's (Spottiswood) was chancellor of the kingdom, the bishop of Ross (Maxwell) on the point of becoming high treasurer; out of fourteen prelates, nine had seats in the privy council, and preponderated there.² Charles and Laud thought the time had come for consummating the matter by imposing upon this church, without consulting either clergy or people, a code of canons, and a mode of worship, in accordance with its new condition.

But the reformation had not been in Scotland, as in England, born of the will of the prince and the servility of the

¹ Burnet's Own Times; Laing, Hist of Scotland, iii. 110.

² Laing, iii. 122.

court. Popular from its commencement, it had, by its own strength, and in spite of all obstacles, mounted to the throne instead of descending from it. No difference of system, situation, or interests had, from the outset, divided its partisans; and in the course of a long struggle, they had accustomed themselves, by turns, to brave and to wield power. The Scottish preachers might boast of having raised the nation, sustained civil war, dethroned a queen, and ruled their king till the day when, ascending a foreign throne, he escaped from their empire. Strong in this union, and in the remembrance of so many victories, they boldly mixed together, in their sermons as in their private thoughts, politics and religion, the affairs of the country and religious controversies; and from the pulpit censured by name the king's ministers and their own parishioners alike freely. The people, in such a school, had acquired the same audacity of mind and speech; owing to themselves alone the triumph of the reformation, they cherished it not only as their creed, but also as the work of their hands. They held as a fundamental maxim the spiritual independence of their church, not the religious supremacy of the monarch, and thought themselves in a position, as well as called upon by duty, to protect against popery, royalty, and episcopacy, that which alone it had set up against them. The preponderance given to their kings, by their elevation to the throne of England, for awhile abated their courage; hence the success of James against those presbyterian doctrines and institutions, which, as simple king of Scotland he had been fain to submit to. Kings are easily deceived by the apparent servility of nations. Scotland intimidated, seemed to Charles, Scotland subdued. By the aid of his supremacy and of episcopacy, he had kept under in England the popular reformation which had always been successfully contested by his predecessors; he thought he could destroy it in Scotland, where it had reigned, where it was alone legally constituted, where the supremacy of the throne was only acknowledged by the bishops themselves, barely able to retain their own position by its support.

The attempt had that issue which has often, in similar cases, been the astonishment and sorrow of the servants of despotism: it failed at the point of apparent success. The re-establishment of episcopacy, the abolition of the ancient laws,

the suspension or corruption of political and religious assemblies, all that could be done out of sight, as it were, of the people, had been done. But the instant that, to complete the work, it became necessary to change the form of public worship, on the very day of the introduction of the new liturgy into the cathedral of Edinburgh, all was over. In a few weeks, a sudden and universal rising brought to Edinburgh¹ (Oct. 18, 1637), from all parts of the kingdom, an immense multitude, landholders, farmers, citizens, tradesmen, peasants, who came to protest against the innovations with which their worship was threatened, and to back their protest by their presence. They crowded the houses and streets, encamped at the gates and beneath the walls of the town, besieged the hall of the privy council, who vainly demanded assistance from the municipal council, itself besieged, insulted the bishops as they passed, and drew up, in the High-street an accusation of tyranny and idolatry against them, which was signed by ecclesiastics, gentlemen, and even by some lords.² The king, without answering their complaints, ordered the petitioners to return home; they obeyed, less from submission than from necessity; and returned in a month (Nov. 15) more numerous than before. This second time there was no disorder, their passion was grave and silent; the upper classes had engaged in the quarrel; in a fortnight, a regular organization of resistance was proposed, adopted, and put in action; a superior council, elected from the different ranks of citizens, was charged to prosecute the general enterprise; in every county, in every town, subordinate councils executed its instructions. The insurrection had disappeared, ready to rise at the voice of the government it had given itself.

Charles at last replied, (Dec. 7),³ but only to confirm the liturgy, and to forbid the petitioners to assemble, under the penalties of treason. The Scottish council were ordered to keep the royal proclamation secret, until the moment of its publication; but ere it reached Scotland, the leaders of the insurrection already knew its contents. They immediately convoked the people, to support their representatives. The council, to anticipate them, at once published the proclamation, (Feb. 19, 1638.) At the same moment, on the very

¹ Rushworth, i. 2, 404.

² Neal, ii. 274; Laing, iii. 136

³ Rushworth, i. 2, 408.

footsteps of the king's heralds, two peers of the realm, lord Hume and lord Lindsay, caused a protest, which they had had signed, to be proclaimed and placarded in the name of their fellow-citizens. Others performed the same office in every place where the king's proclamation was read. Every day more excited, more menaced, more united, the insurgents at last resolved to bind themselves by a solemn league, similar to those which, since the origin of the reformation, Scotland had several times adopted, in order to set forth and maintain before all men their rights, their faith, and their wishes. Alexander Henderson, the most influential of the ecclesiastics, and Archibald Johnston, afterwards lord Warriston, a celebrated advocate, drew up this league under the popular name of *Covenant*; it was revised and approved of by the lords Balmerino, Loudon, and Rothes, (March 1, 1638.) It contained, besides a minute and already ancient profession of faith, the formal rejection of the new canons and liturgy, and an oath of national union to defend, against every danger, the sovereign, the religion, the laws and liberties of the country. It was no sooner proposed than it was received with universal transport. Messengers, relieving each other from village to village, carried it, with incredible rapidity, to the most remote parts of the kingdom, as the fiery cross was borne over the mountains to call to war all the vassals of the same chieftain.¹ Gentlemen, clergy, citizens, labourers, women, children, all assembled in crowds in the churches, in the streets, to swear fealty to the covenant. Even the highlanders, seized with the national impulse, forgot for a moment their passionate loyalty and fierce animosity to the lowlanders, and joined the insurgents. In less than six weeks, all Scotland was confederated under the law of the covenant. The persons employed by government,

¹ When a chief wished to assemble his clan on any sudden and important occasion, he killed a goat, made a cross of some light wood, set the four ends of it on fire, and then extinguished them in the blood of the goat. This cross was called the *fiery cross*, or the cross of shame; because he who refused to obey the token was declared infamous. The cross was given into the hands of a quick and trusty messenger, who, running rapidly to the nearest hamlet, transferred it to the principal person, without uttering any other word than the name of the place of rendezvous. The new messenger forwarded it with equal promptitude to the next village; it thus went, with amazing celerity, over the whole district dependent on the same

a few thousand catholics, and the town of Aberdeen, alone refused to join it.

So much daring astonished Charles: he had been told of insane riots by a miserable rabble; the municipal council of Edinburgh had even come forward humbly to solicit his clemency, promising the prompt chastisement of the factious; and his Scottish courtiers boasted daily of learning, by their correspondence, that all was quiet, or nearly so.¹ Incensed at the powerlessness of his will, he resolved to have recourse to force; but nothing was ready; it was necessary to gain time. The marquis of Hamilton was sent to Scotland, instructed to flatter the rebels with some hope, but not to say anything binding the king or to come to any settlement. Twenty thousand covenanters, assembled at Edinburgh for a solemn fast, went to meet Hamilton, (June, 1638;) seven hundred clergymen, dressed in their robes, stood on an eminence by the road side, singing a psalm as he passed.² The party wished to give the marquis a high idea of its strength; and Hamilton, as well to preserve his credit with the country as to obey the instructions of his master, was inclined to seem conciliatory. But the concessions he proposed were deemed insufficient and deceitful; a royal covenant he attempted to set up, in opposition to the popular covenant, was rejected with derision. After several useless interviews, and several journeys from Edinburgh to London, he suddenly (Sept.) received from the king orders to grant to the insurgents all their demands; the abolition of the canons, of the liturgy, and of the court of high commission; the promise of an assembly of the kirk, and of a parliament in which all questions should be freely debated, and in which even the bishops might be impeached. The Scots were at once rejoiced, and utterly amazed; but still mistrustful, and the more so from the care taken to remove

chief; and passed on to those of his allies, if the danger was common to them. At the sight of the fiery cross, every man from sixteen to sixty, capable of bearing arms, was obliged to take his best weapons and his best accoutrements, and to proceed to the place of rendezvous. He who failed in this, was liable to have his lands devastated by fire and blood; a peril of which the fiery cross was the emblem. In the civil war of 1745, the fiery cross was often in circulation in Scotland; once in particular, it travelled in three hours the whole district of Bredalbane, about thirty miles. This custom existed in most of the Scandinavian nations.

¹ Clarendon, i.

² May

every pretext for their longer confederating. The general synod assembled at Glasgow, (Nov. 21.) It soon perceived that Hamilton's only object was to impede their progress, and to introduce into its acts some nullifying articles. Such, in fact, were the king's instructions.¹ The assembly, however, proceeded, and were taking measures to bring the bishops to trial, when Hamilton suddenly pronounced their dissolution. (Nov. 28.) At the same time they heard that Charles was preparing for war, and that a body of troops levied in Ireland, by the exertions of Strafford, was on the point of embarking for Scotland.² Hamilton departed for London; but the synod refused to disperse, continued their deliberations, condemned all the royal innovations, asserted the covenant, and abolished episcopacy. Several lords, till then neutral, (among others the earl of Argyle, a powerful nobleman, and renowned for his wisdom,) openly embraced the cause of their country. Scottish merchants went abroad to buy ammunition and arms; the covenant was sent to the Scottish troops serving on the Continent, and one of their best officers, Alexander Leslie, was invited to return home, to take, in case of need, the command of the insurgents. Finally, in the name of the Scottish people, a declaration was addressed to the English nation, (Feb. 27,) to acquaint them with the just grievances of their brother Christians, and to repel the calumnies with which their common enemies sought to blacken them and their cause.

The court received this declaration with ridicule; the conduct of the insurgents was laughed at there, as absurd insolence; the only thing the courtiers professed to be annoyed at was the degrading annoyance of having to fight them; for what glory, what profit, could be got by a war with a people so poor, vulgar, and obscure?³ Though a Scotchman himself, Charles trusted that the old hatred and contempt of the English for Scotland would prevent the covenanters' complaints from taking any effect upon men's minds in the south. But the faith which unites nations soon effaces the boundary-lines that divide them. In the cause of the Scots, the malcontents of England ardently recognised their own. Secret correspondence was rapidly established between the two kingdoms. The declarations of the insurgents were spread everywhere; their griev-

¹ See Appendix. No. V.

² Strafford, ii. 233. 278, 279.

³ May, i. 47.

ances, their proceedings, their hopes, became the subject of popular conversation; in a short time, they acquired friends and agents in London, in all the counties, in the army, even at court. As soon as their firm resolution to resist was ascertained, and that opinion in England seemed to lend them its support, there were not wanting Scotch, and even English courtiers, who, to injure some rival, to revenge themselves for some refusal, to provide against chances, hastened to render them, underhand, good service, sometimes by sending them information, sometimes by exaggerating to the other courtiers their number, boasting of their discipline, and affecting great uneasiness on the king's account, and regret that he should incur such difficulties and dangers from want of a little complaisance. The royal army, in its way towards Scotland, encountered a thousand reports spread on purpose to intimidate and keep it back; the earl of Essex, its general, was earnestly advised to beware, to wait for reinforcements; the enemy, it was said, was much superior to him; they had been seen at such a place, near the frontiers; they occupied all the fortresses; even Berwick would be in their hands before he could arrive there. The earl, a scrupulous and faithful officer, though but little favourable to the designs of the court, continued his march, entered Berwick without obstacle, and soon found that the troops of the insurgents were neither so numerous nor so well prepared as he had been told. Yet these reports, as eagerly listened to as they were carefully spread, did not the less trouble men's minds.¹ The anxiety increased when the king arrived at York, (April.) He went there surrounded with extraordinary pomp, still infatuated with the idea of the irresistible ascendancy of royal majesty, and flattering himself that to display it would suffice to make the rebels return to their duty. As if to balance the appeal of nation to nation, which had been made by Scotland to England, he, in his turn, appealed to the nobility of his kingdom, summoning them, according to the feudal custom, to come and render him, on this occasion, the service they owed him.

The lords and a crowd of gentlemen flocked to York as to a festival. The town and camp presented the appearance of a court and tournament, not at all that of an army and of

¹ Clarendon, i.

war. Charles's vanity was delighted with such display; but intrigue, disorder, and insubordination prevailed around him.¹ The Scots on the frontiers familiarly communicated with his soldiers. He wanted to exact from the lords an oath, that they would upon no pretext whatever keep up any connexion with the rebels; lord Brook and lord Say refused to take it; and Charles dared not proceed further against them than to order them to quit his court. Lord Holland entered the Scottish territory, but on seeing a body of troops whom Leslie had skilfully disposed, and whom the earl, without much examination, considered more numerous than his own, he withdrew with precipitation.² Officers and soldiers all hesitated to commence a war so generally anathematized. The Scots, well informed of what passed, took advantage of this disposition. They wrote to the chiefs of the army, to lord Essex, lord Arundel, lord Holland, in moderate and flattering terms, expressing an entire confidence in the sentiments of the nobility as well as of the people of England, and praying them to interpose and obtain for them from the king justice and the restoration of his favour.³ Soon, sure of being supported, they addressed the king himself, with humble respect; but without relinquishing any of their claims.⁴ Charles, a man without energy, and as readily put out by obstacles as he was heedless before they presented themselves, felt altogether embarrassed. Conferences were opened, (June 11.)⁵ The king was haughty, but eager to conclude the matter; the Scots obstinate, but not insolent. Charles's pride was content with the humility of their language; and on the 18th of June, 1639, by the advice of Laud himself, uneasy, it is said, at the approach of danger, a pacification was concluded at Berwick, under which both armies were ordered to break up, and a synod and Scotch parliament to be shortly convoked, but without any clear and precise treaty to put an end to the differences which had given rise to the war.

That war was only adjourned, and this both parties equally foresaw. The Scots, in dismissing their troops, gave the officers an advance of pay, and ordered them to hold themselves constantly in readiness.⁶ On his side, Charles had scarcely disbanded his army before he began secretly to

Clarendon, i.

Rushworth, ii. 2, 938.

Rushworth, ii. 2, 935.

³ Ib. 940.² Clarendon, i.⁶ Whitelocke, 31.

levy another. A month after the pacification he sent for Strafford to London to consult him, as he said, on some military plans; and he added, "I have much more, and indeed too much cause to desire your counsel and attendance for some time, which I think not fit to express by letter, more than this: the Scots covenant begins to spread too far."¹ Strafford obeyed the summons instantly. It had long been his most ardent desire to be employed near his master, the only post in which his ambition could hope for the power and glory it aimed at. He arrived, resolved to employ against the adversaries of the crown the whole of his energies; speaking of the Scots with profound contempt, asserting that irresolution alone had caused the late failure, and yet so confident in the firmness of the king, that he promised himself from it irresistible support. He found the court agitated with petty intrigues; the earl of Essex, treated coldly, notwithstanding his good conduct in the campaign, had retired in discontent; the officers mutually accused each other of incapacity or want of courage; the queen's favourites were eagerly at work, seeking to turn the general embarrassments to the advancement of their own fortunes and the downfall of their rivals; the king himself was low-spirited and anxious.² Strafford, however, soon felt ill at ease, and unable to obtain the adoption of what he judged necessary or to carry out even what he had got adopted. The intrigues of the courtiers were soon directed against him. He could not prevent one of his personal enemies, sir Harry Vane, from being, through the queen's influence, elevated to the rank of secretary of state.³ The public, who had witnessed his arrival with anxiety, uncertain what use he would make of his power, soon learned that he was urging the most rigorous measures, and pursued him with their maledictions.⁴ Matters became pressing. A dispute had arisen between the king and the Scots, as to the construction of the treaty of Berwick, of which scarcely anything had been reduced to writing; Charles had had a paper, which, according to the covenants, expressed its real conditions, burnt by the common hangman; of this the Scots now loudly complained, and the king did not care to put forth anything in disproof of their statements, for in negotiating he had

Strafford's Letters and Despatches, ii. 372.

² Clarendon, i. 214.

³ Clarendon, i. 216.

⁴ May, i. 54, *et seq.*

permitted them to hope that which he did not mean to accomplish.¹ Irritated by this want of faith, and exhorted by their English friends to redouble their distrust, the synod and parliament of Scotland, far from yielding any of their pretensions, put forward others still more daring. The parliament demanded that the king should be bound to convoke them every three years, that freedom of election and of speech should be assured them, so that political liberty, firmly secured, might watch over the maintenance of the national faith.² The words, 'attempt on the prerogative,' 'invaded sovereignty,' and so on, now sounded more loudly than ever at court and in the council: "I wish these people," said Strafford, "were well whipped into their right senses."³ War was resolved upon. But how maintain it? what new and plausible motives put forward to the nation? The public treasury was empty, the king's private purse exhausted, and opinion, already sufficiently powerful to make it advisable it should be heard, if not followed. The pretext sought for offered itself. From the beginning of the troubles, cardinal Richelieu, displeased with the English court, in which Spanish influence prevailed, had been in correspondence with the Scots; he had an agent among them, had sent them money and arms, and promised, in case of need, greater assistance. A letter from the principal covenanters was intercepted, bearing the address, 'To the king,' and evidently intended for the king of France, whose assistance it requested.⁴ Charles and the council did not doubt that this appeal to a foreign prince, high treason by law, would inspire all England with an indignation equal to their own; this was enough, they thought, to convince all minds of the legitimacy of the war. In this confidence, which served to veil the hard yoke of necessity, the calling of a new parliament was determined upon, and meantime, Strafford returned to Ireland (March 16, 1640) to obtain supplies and soldiers from the parliament of that kingdom also.

¹ Clarendon, i.; Rushworth, ii. 2, 965.

² Rushworth, i. 2, 992.

³ Strafford's Letters, ii. 138.

⁴ Clarendon, i.; Whitelocke, 32. See in particular the pieces published on this subject by M. Mazure, at the end of his *Hist. de la Revolution de 1688*, iii. 402. They evidently prove, contrary to the opinion of Hume, Laing, Brodie, &c., that the letter of the Scottish chiefs was actually sent to the king of France, and that he received it, though Charles managed to intercept a copy of it.

At the news that a parliament was summoned, England was astonished; it had ceased to hope for a legal reform, though such was all it had thought of. However great its discontent, all violent designs were foreign to the ideas of the nation. Sectarians, in some places the multitude, and a few men already compromised as leaders of the nascent parties, alone fostered darker passions and more extended designs. The public had approved and upheld them in their resistance, but without sharing in any of their ulterior projects, or even conceiving their existence. Continuous troubles had made many worthy citizens doubt, if not as to the lawfulness, at least as to the propriety of the ardour and obstinacy of the last parliaments. They called to mind, without blaming, but with regret, the harshness of their language, the disorderly character of their excited debates, and all promised themselves greater moderation in future. Under the influence of these feelings, the constituencies returned a house of commons opposed to the court, resolved to have all grievances redressed, and in which all those men whose opposition had rendered them popular took a seat, but composed, for the most part, of peaceable citizens, free from all party engagements, afraid of all violence, all secret combinations, and precipitate resolutions, and flattering themselves they should reform abuses without offending the king, or hazarding the peace of the country.

After considerable delay, which gave some displeasure, the parliament met, (April 13, 1640.) Charles had the letter of the Scots to the king of France laid before it, enlarged upon their treason, announced war, and demanded subsidies. The house of commons took little notice of the letter, and seemed to regard it as an incident of no importance compared with the great interests they had at stake.¹ This offended the king, who thought the house took up his quarrel with too much indifference. On their side, the house complained of a certain want of respect and etiquette towards their speaker, on the day of his presentation to the king.² The court, after having passed eleven years without a parliament, had some difficulty in laying aside its scornful levity; and the house, notwithstanding their pacific intentions, had very naturally resumed, on their return to Westminster, the dignity of a public

¹ Parl. Hist. ii. 535.

² Ib.

power, eleven years slighted, and recalled from necessity. The debates soon assumed a grave character. The king required the house to vote the subsidies before they proceeded to consider their grievances, promising he would let them sit afterwards, and listen with kindness to their representations. Long discussions arose on this point, but without violence, though the sittings were attended with earnest assiduity, and prolonged much later than usual.¹ A few bitter words, escaping from members not much known, were immediately repressed, and the speeches of several servants of the crown, esteemed in other respects, met with a favourable reception.² But still the house showed a thorough determination to have their grievances redressed before they voted supplies. In vain was it urged that war was imminent; they cared little about the war, though they did not say as much, out of respect for the king. Charles had recourse to the interposition of the lords. They voted that in their opinion the subsidies ought to precede the question of grievances; and demanded a conference with the commons to exhort them to this procedure.³ The commons accepted the conference, but voted, in their turn, on re-entering their own chamber, that the resolution of the lords was an infringement of their privileges, for that they had no right to take notice of supplies till they came regularly before them.⁴ Pym, Hampden, St. John, and others, seized upon this incident to inflame the house, whose intentions were more moderate than suited its principles and its position. It grew agitated, impatient, but still checking itself, though fully resolved to maintain its rights. Time passed on; the king permitted himself to say that this parliament would be as intractable as its predecessors. Already irritated, he sent a message to the house, that if they would grant him twelve subsidies, payable in three years, he would engage henceforth never to levy ship-money without the consent of parliament, (May 4, 1640.)⁵ The sum seemed enormous; it was more, they said, than all the money in the kingdom. Besides, it was not sufficient that the king should give up ship-money; it was essential that, as a principle, both as to the past and as to the future, it should be declared illegal. The house, however, had no desire to break entirely with the

¹ Clarendon, i.² Ib.³ Parl. Hist. ii. 560; Clarendon, i.⁴ Ib. ii. 563; ib. i. 231.⁵ Ib. ii. 570; ib. i. 232.

king; it was demonstrated that the amount of the twelve subsidies was not, by a great deal, so high as had been at first said; and notwithstanding their repugnance to suspend the examination of grievances, to show their good faith and loyalty, they took the message into consideration. They were on the point of deciding that subsidies should be granted without fixing the amount, when the secretary of state, sir Harry Vane, rose, and said, that unless the whole of the message were adopted, it was not worth while to deliberate, for that the king would not accept less than he had asked. The attorney-general, Herbert, confirmed Vane's statement.¹ Astonishment and anger took possession of the house; the most moderate were struck with consternation. It was late, the debate was adjourned till the next day. But on that day, the moment the commons assembled, the king summoned them to the upper house; and three weeks after its convocation parliament was dissolved, (May 5.)

An hour after the dissolution, Edward Hyde, afterwards lord Clarendon, met St. John, the friend of Hampden, and one of the leaders of the opposition, already formed into a party. Hyde was dispirited; St. John, on the contrary, though of a naturally sombre countenance, and who was never seen to smile, had now a joyous look and beaming eyes:—"What disturbs you?" said he to Hyde. "That which disturbs many honest men," answered Hyde, "the so imprudent dissolution of so sensible and moderate a parliament, which, in our present disorders, was the only one likely to apply a remedy." "Ah, well," said St. John, "before things get better, they must get still worse; this parliament would never have done what must be done."²

The same day, in the evening, Charles was full of regret; the disposition of the house, he said, had been falsely represented to him: he had never authorized Vane to declare that unless he had twelve subsidies he would accept of none. Next day, too, he was very uneasy, and assembling a few experienced men, asked whether the dissolution could not be recalled. This was judged impossible; and Charles returned to despotism, a little more anxious, but as reckless, as haughty, as before the attempt he had just made to quit it.

¹ Clarendon, i.

The urgency of the situation seemed for a moment to restore to his ministers some confidence, to their measures some success; Strafford had returned from Ireland, (April 4,) suffering under a violent attack of the gout, threatened with a pleurisy, and unable to move.¹ But he had obtained from the Irish parliament all he had asked; subsidies, soldiers, offers, promises; and as soon as he could leave his bed, he set once more to the work with his accustomed vigour and devotion. In less than three weeks, voluntary contributions, under the influence of his example, poured into the exchequer nearly 300,000*l.*, the catholics furnishing the greatest part of it.² With these were combined all the vexatious means in use, forced loans, ship-money, monopolies; the coining of base money was even suggested.³ In the eyes of the king and his servants, necessity excused everything: but necessity is never the limit of tyranny: Charles resumed against the members of the parliament his old and worse than useless practices of persecution and vengeance. Sir Henry Bellasis and sir John Hotham were imprisoned for their speeches; the house and papers of lord Brook were searched; Mr. Carew was sent to the Tower for having refused to give up the petitions he had received during the session, as chairman of the committee appointed to examine them.⁴ An oath was exacted from all the clergy never to consent to any alteration in the government of the church; and the oath concluded with an *et cætera* which provoked a smile of mistrust and anger.⁵ Never had more arrogant or harsher language been used: some Yorkshire gentlemen had refused to comply with an arbitrary requisition; the council wished to prosecute them: "The only way with my gentlemen," said Strafford, "is to send for them up and lay them by the heels."⁶ He knew better than any other the extent of the inevitable evils; but passion in him stifled alike all prudence and all fear; it seemed as though his earnest effort was to communicate to the king, the council, and the court, that fever which blinds man

¹ Strafford's Letters, ii. 403.

² Neal, ii. 296.

³ May, i. 63; Whitelocke, 32.

⁴ Parl. Hist. ii. 584; Rushworth, ii. 2, 1196.

⁵ The following was the purport of this paragraph: "I swear, never to give consent to any alteration in the government of this church, ruled as it is at present by archbishops, bishops, deacons, archdeacons, &c." Neal, ii. 302; Rushworth, ii. 2, 1186.

⁶ Strafford's Letters, ii. 400.

to his true condition and to his danger. He again fell ill, and was even at the brink of the grave; but his physical weakness only increased the harshness of his counsels; and almost ere he could stand, he departed with the king for the army, already assembled on the frontiers of Scotland, and which he was to command.

On his way, he learnt that the Scots, taking the offensive, had entered England (Aug. 21), and on arriving at York, he found that at Newburn (Aug. 28), they had beaten, almost without resistance, the first English troops that had come in their way. Neither of these events was the work of the Scots alone. During the pacification, their agents in London had contracted a close alliance with the leaders of the malcontents, who had exhorted them, if the war recommenced, promptly to invade England, promising them the aid of a numerous party. A messenger was even sent to Scotland bearing inclosed in a hollow staff an engagement to that purpose, at the foot of which, to inspire the Scots with more confidence, lord Saville, the only ostensible leader of the plot, had counterfeited the signatures of six of the greatest English lords. A fierce hatred against Strafford had alone induced lord Saville, a man of very indifferent character, and held in very light estimation, to engage in this audacious intrigue; but there is every probability that some most influential and most sincere patriots had also taken part in it.¹ They had not misconceived the disposition of the people. Parliament was no sooner dissolved, than aversion for the war was everywhere openly displayed. In London, placards called upon the apprentices to rise and tear in pieces Laud, the author of so many evils. A furious band attacked his palace, and he was obliged to seek refuge at Whitehall. St. Paul's church, where the court of high commission sat, was forced by another party, crying, *No bishops, no high commission!*² In the counties, violence alone procured recruits. To escape enlistment, many persons mutilated, some hanged themselves;³ those who obeyed the call without resistance, were insulted in the streets and treated as cowards by their families and friends. Joining their regiments, they carried

¹ Burnet, Own Times, Whitelocke; Hardwicke's Papers, II. 187.

² Clarendon, I.; Whitelocke, 34.

³ Strafford's Letters, II. 351

thither, and there found the same feelings. Several officers, suspected of popery, were killed by their soldiers.¹ When the army came up with the Scots, the insubordination and murmuring redoubled; it saw the covenant floating, written in large characters on the Scottish standards; it heard the drum calling the troops to sermon, and at sunrise the whole camp ringing with psalms and prayers. At this sight, at the accounts which reached them of the pious ardour and friendly disposition of Scotland towards the English, the soldiers were alternately softened and incensed, cursing this impious war, and already vanquished, for they felt as if fighting against their brethren and against God.² Arrived on the banks of the Tyne, the Scots, without any hostile demonstration, asked leave to pass. An English sentinel fired at them; a few cannons answered; an action commenced, and almost immediately the English army dispersed, and Strafford only took the command of it to return to York; leaving the Scots to occupy, without obstacle, the country and the towns between that city and the frontiers of the two kingdoms.³

From that moment Strafford himself was conquered. In vain did he endeavour, now by good words, now by threats, to inspire the troops with other feelings; his advances to the officers were constrained, and ill concealed his contempt and anger; his rigour irritated the soldiers without intimidating them. Petitions from several counties soon arrived, entreating the king to conclude a peace. Lords Wharton and Howard ventured to present one themselves; Strafford caused them to be arrested, convoked a court-martial, and demanded that they should be shot, at the head of the army, as abettors of revolt. The court remained silent; at length, Hamilton spoke: "My lord," said he to Strafford, "when this sentence of yours is pronounced, are you sure of the soldiers?" Strafford, as if struck with a sudden revelation, turned away his head shudderingly, and made no reply.⁴ Yet his indomitable pride still upheld his hopes; "Let the king but speak the word," he wrote to Laud, "and I will make the Scots go hence faster than they came; I would answer for it, on my life; but the instructions must come from another than me." In fact,

¹ Rushworth, i. 1181-2.

² Heylin, *Life of Laud*, 451.

³ Clarendon, i.; Rushworth, ii. 2, 1236.

⁴ Burnet, *Own Times*.

Charles already avoided him, afraid of the energy of his councils.

This prince had fallen into profound despondency; every day brought him some new proof of his weakness; money was wanting, and the old means of raising it no longer answered; the soldiers mutinied or deserted in whole bands; the people were everywhere in a state of excitement, impatient for the result which was now inevitable; the correspondence with the Scots was renewed around him, in his camp, in his very house. The latter, still prudent in their actions, humble in their speech, spared the counties they had invaded, loaded their prisoners with kindness and attention, and renewed at every opportunity their protestations of pacific views, of fidelity and devotion to the king, certain of victory, but anxious that it should be the victory of peace. In connexion with the word peace, that of parliament began to be combined. Thereupon Charles, seized with fear, determined, (Sept. 7,)¹ by whose advice is not known, to assemble at York the great council of the peers of the kingdom, a feudal assembly, fallen into desuetude for the last four centuries, but which formerly, in the time of the weakness of the commons, had often shared alone the sovereign power. Without well knowing what this assembly was, or what it could do, there was hoped from it more complaisance and consideration for the king's honour; it became a question, at court, whether possibly this assembly could not of itself vote subsidies.² But, before this great council had met, two petitions, one from the city of London,³ the other from twelve of the most eminent peers,⁴ solicited in express terms, the convocation of a constitutional parliament. This was enough to overcome the remaining resistance of a king who could do nothing further. In the midst of these doubts and fears, Strafford, as much to gratify his resentment, as to justify his councils, had attacked the Scots and obtained some advantage over them; he was censured as having compromised the king, and received orders to confine himself to his quarters.⁵ The peers met. (Sept. 24.)

¹ Rushworth. ii. 2, 1257.

² Clarendon, i.

³ Rushworth. ii. 2, 1263.

1b. 1262: lords Essex, Bedford, Hertford, Warwick, Bristol, Mulgrave, Say and Seal, Howard, Bolingbroke, Mandeville, Brook, and Paget.

⁵ Clarendon. i. Lingard, x. 95, and Brodie, ii. 589, deny the facts.

Charles announced to them that he was about to summon a parliament, and only claimed their advice in treating with the Scots.¹ Negotiations were begun. Sixteen peers, all inclined to the popular party, were charged with their management.² It was first stipulated that both armies should remain on foot, and that the king should pay that of the Scots as well as his own. For this purpose a loan of 200,000*l.* was requested of the city of London, and the peers added their word to that of the king for its proper expenditure.³ After signing, at Ripon, the preliminary articles, Charles, anxious to relax in the queen's society, from so many difficulties and annoyances, transferred the negotiation to London, (Oct. 23,)⁴ where the parliament was about to assemble. The Scottish commissioners hastened thither, certain of finding powerful allies. The elections were proceeding throughout England, with the utmost excitement. The court, sad and dispirited, in vain sought to exercise some influence over them; their candidates, feebly supported, were rejected on all sides; they could not even carry the return of sir Thomas Gardiner, whom the king wished to have as speaker.⁵ The meeting of parliament was fixed for the 3rd of November. Some persons advised Laud to choose another day; this, they said, was one of bad omen: the parliament assembled on that day, under Henry VIII., began with the ruin of cardinal Wolsey, and ended with the destruction of the monasteries.⁶ Laud disregarded the presages, not from superior confidence, but because he was weary of the struggle, and, like his master, recklessly relied upon the chances of a future, the results of which, however, both victors and vanquished were very far from suspecting.

from inductions derived from official and contemporary documents; but their reasons do not appear to me sufficient to justify the rejection of the evidence of Clarendon, whose narrative is formal, circumstantial, and who had no motive for deviating from the truth on this point.

¹ Rushworth, ii. 2, 1276.

² Lords Bedford, Hertford, Essex, Salisbury, Warwick, Bristol, Holland, Berkshire, Mandeville, Wharton, Paget, Brook, Pawlet, Howard, Saville, Dunsmore.

³ Rushworth, ii. 2, 1279.

⁴ Clarendon; Whitelocke, 37.

⁵ Ib. 1286.

⁶ Whitelocke, 37.

BOOK THE THIRD.

1640—1642.

Opening of parliament—It seizes on power—State of religious and political parties—The king's concessions—Negotiations between the king and the leaders of parliament—Conspiracy in the army—Strafford's trial and death—The king's journey to Scotland—Insurrection in Ireland—Debate on the remonstrance—The king's return to London—Progress of the revolution—Riots—Affair of the five members—The king leaves London—The queen's departure for the continent—Affair of the militia—Negotiations—The king fixes his residence at York—Both parties prepare for war—The king refused admission to Hull—Vain attempts at conciliation—Formation of the two armies.

On the appointed day the king opened parliament. He went to Westminster without pomp, almost without retinue, not on horseback and along the streets as usual, but by the Thames, in a plain boat, shunning observation, like a prisoner following the triumph of his conqueror. His speech was vague and embarrassed. In it he promised the redress of all grievances, but persisted in calling the Scots 'rebels,' and in demanding that they should be driven from the kingdom, as if the war was still proceeding. The commons heard him with cold respect. Never at the opening of a session had the attendance been so numerous; never had their faces worn so proud an aspect in presence of the sovereign.¹

The king had scarcely quitted the house, ere his friends—there were very few of them—clearly perceived, from the conversation of the various groups, that the public indignation surpassed even what they had feared. The dissolution of the last parliament had exasperated even the most moderate. There was no longer talk of conciliation or caution.

¹ Clarendon, ii. 1.

The day was come, they said, for putting in force the whole power of parliament, and eradicating all abuses so effectually that not a stray root should remain. Thus, with very unequal strength, thoughts equally haughty found themselves drawn up in battle array. For eleven years the king and the church had proclaimed their absolute, independent, *jure divino* sovereignty; they had tried all modes of forcing it upon the nation. Unable to effect this, and yet insisting upon the same maxims, they came, in their own weakness, to seek aid from an assembly, which, without putting it forward as a principle, without making any show of it, believed in their own sovereignty, and felt themselves capable of exercising it.

They began by a distinct announcement of all their grievances. Each member brought with him a petition from his town or county; he read it, and, taking it as the text of a speech, proposed, in each case, that the house, till more efficacious measures could be adopted, should at least vote the complaints to be legitimate.¹ Thus, in a few days, opinion from all parts of the country declared itself. Thus were passed in review and condemned, all the acts of tyranny, monopolies, ship-money, arbitrary arrests, the usurpations of the bishops, the proceedings of the extraordinary courts. None opposed the resolutions;² such was the unanimity, that several were adopted on the motion of men who, soon after, became the most intimate confidants of the king.³

As if these means were not sufficient to reveal the whole state of the case, more than forty committees were appointed to inquire into abuses, and to receive the complaints of the citizens.⁴ From day to day, tradesmen and farmers came on horseback, in whole bands, bearers to parliament of the complaints of their town or district.⁵ In every direction, such accusations were called for; they resounded from the pulpit, in the public streets, and were eagerly received, from whatever quarter, in whatever form, and admitted with equal confidence, whether they arraigned generally the whole government, or individuals, whose punishment, by name, was demanded. The power of the committees was unlimited; no one had a right to oppose them even by silence, and the mem-

¹ Parl. Hist. ii. 640.

² Ib. 672.

³ Sir John Colepepper, lord Digby, lord Falkland, &c.

⁴ Rushworth, i. 2, 28; Neal, ii. 318.

⁵ Whitelocke, &c. 33

bers of the privy council themselves were obliged to state, if called upon, what had passed in their deliberations.¹

To the disapprobation of acts was joined the general proscription of the actors. Every agent of the crown, of what rank soever, who had taken part in the execution of the measures condemned, was marked by the name of 'delinquent.'² In every county, a list of the delinquents was drawn up. No uniform and definitive punishment was put in effect against them; but they might, at any time, at the pleasure of the house, on the least pretext of some new offence, be brought before it, and punished by fines, imprisonment, or confiscation.

In examining their own elections, the house declared unworthy of a seat among them whoever had taken part in any monopoly, (Nov. 9, 1640.) Four members were on this ground excluded, (Jan. 21, 1641.) Such was the case also with several others under the pretext of some irregularity, but, in reality, without legal justification, and merely because their opinions were distrusted. Two of the most notorious monopolists, sir Henry Mildmay and Mr. Whitaker, were admitted without obstacle: they had come over to the dominant party.³

At the aspect of this power, so immense, so unlooked for, so determined, fear seized upon all the servants of the crown, upon all who had to apprehend an accusation or an enemy. For them, danger impended from all sides, defence presented itself nowhere. The sole desire of the court now was to pass unnoticed; the king concealed his affliction, his uneasiness, under the veil of complete inaction; the judges, trembling for themselves, would not have dared to protect a delinquent; the bishops, without attempting to prevent it, saw their innovations abolished all around them. John Bancroft, bishop of Oxford, died suddenly, from vexation and fear;⁴ the presbyterian preachers resumed, without any legal steps, possession of their livings and pulpits; all the dissenting sects publicly assembled again; pamphlets of every description circulated in full liberty. Royal and episcopal despotism, though still existent, with its ministers, its tribunals, its laws, its worship, was everywhere motionless, powerless.⁵

¹ Clarendon.

² Id.

³ Parl. Hist. ii. 651; Clarendon.

⁴ Rapin, ix. 21.

⁵ Clarendon; Neal, ii. 320.

Strafford had foreseen this explosion, and entreated the king to dispense with his attending parliament. "He should not be able to do his majesty any service there," he wrote to him, "but should rather be a means to hinder his affairs; in regard he foresaw that the great envy and ill will of the parliament and of the Scots would be bent against him. Whereas, if he kept out of sight, he would not be so much in their mind, as he should be by showing himself in parliament; and if they should fall upon him, he being at a distance, whatsoever they should conclude against him, he might the better avoid, and retire from any danger, having the liberty of being out of their hands, and to go over to Ireland, or to some other place where he might be most serviceable to his majesty." But the king being very earnest for Strafford's coming, laid his commands upon him, and told him, "that as he was king of England he was able to secure him from any danger, and that parliament should not touch one hair of his head."¹ Strafford still hesitated, but upon a second invitation, braving the storm, since it was inevitable, he set out with the resolution of himself accusing before the upper house, on proofs recently collected, the principal members of the house of commons, of having excited and aided the Scottish invasion. Aware of the blow he was about to strike, Pym and his friends struck first. On the 9th of November, Strafford arrived in London; on the 10th, fatigue and fever confined him to his bed; on the 11th, the house of commons closed their doors, and, on the motion of Pym, abruptly impeached him for high treason. Lord Falkland alone, though an enemy of Strafford's, said that delay and some examination seemed required by the justice and dignity of the house. "The least delay may lose everything," said Pym; "if the earl talk but once with the king, parliament will be dissolved; besides, the house only impeaches: it is not the judge." And he proceeded immediately, with a committee, to lay the accusation before the lords.²

Strafford was at this time with the king. At the first inti-

¹ Whitelocke, 37. One would think Mr. Lingard (x. 207) had not seen this passage; for he says it was only the friends of Strafford who advised him not to go to London, but that for his own part he did not hesitate an instant.

² State Trials. iii. 1383.

mation, he hastened to the upper house, where Pym had preceded him. He found the doors closed, and angrily rebuked the usher, who hesitated to admit him; he was advancing up the hall to take his seat, when several voices called upon him to retire. The earl stopped, looked round, and, after a few minutes' hesitation, obeyed. Recalled an hour afterwards, he was directed to kneel at the bar: he was then informed that the lords had accepted his impeachment, and decided, on the demand of the commons, that he should be sent to the Tower. He attempted to speak, but the house refused to hear him, and the order of commitment was forthwith executed.¹

To the impeachment of Strafford almost immediately succeeded that of Laud, a man less feared, but still more odious. A fanatic as sincere as stern, his conscience reproached him with nothing, and he was utterly astonished at the impeachment. "Not one man in the house of commons," he said, "does, in his heart, believe me a traitor." The earl of Essex sharply took up these words as insulting to the commons, who had accused him. Laud, still more surprised, made an apology, and begged to be treated according to the ancient usages of parliament. Lord Say expressed himself indignant that he should pretend to prescribe to them how they were to proceed. The archbishop, now thoroughly agitated, was silent, incapable of understanding other passions than his own, or of remembering that he had ever thus spoken to his enemies (Dec. 18.)²

Two other ministers, the lord keeper Finch, and the secretary of state Windebank, had taken an equally active part in tyranny; but the former, a crafty courtier, had foreseen what was coming, and for the last three months had applied himself, at his master's expense, in gaining the indulgence of the leaders of the opposition; the other, a weak man and of mediocre understanding, inspired neither hatred nor fear. The commons, however, impeached both, though without any exhibition of passion, and as if merely to satisfy the public demand. Windebank absconded. Lord Finch obtained permission to appear before the house, and there, in humble terms but graceful manner, made an unmeaning apology, (Dec. 21.) The party

¹ State Trials, iii. 1384.

² Ib. iv. 319.

was pleased with this, as the first homage paid by a minister of the crown to its power, and allowed him time to make his way beyond sea. Several members were astonished at this so partial justice; but Pym and Hampden, skilful leaders, did not wish to discourage baseness on the part of their opponents.¹ Impeachments against two bishops, some theologians, and six judges, were also set on foot. But that of Strafford alone was followed up with ardour. A secret committee, invested with immense powers, was commissioned to scrutinize his whole life, to trace, in his words as well as in his acts, nay, even in the councils he had given, whether the king had adopted them or not, proofs of high treason.² A similar committee formed in Ireland, served as an auxiliary to that of the commons. The Scots concurred by a virulent declaration, hinting very unmistakably that their army would not leave the kingdom till justice had been done on their most cruel enemy. To popular hatred and fear, it did not seem too much that the three nations should be leagued against one prisoner.³

Thus delivered from their adversaries, and preparing signal vengeance against the only one they feared, the commons took possession of the government. They voted subsidies, but of insignificant amount, merely sufficient to supply the necessities of each day.⁴ Commissioners selected from their body, and named in the bill, were alone entrusted with their application. The custom duties, in like manner, were only voted for two months, and renewed from time to time. To meet the expenses, more considerable and more prompt revenues were needed. The commons borrowed, but in their own name, from their partisans in the city, even from their own members, and on the sole security of their promise: thus originated public credit.⁵ The king pressed the dismissal of the two armies, particularly that of the Scots, dwelling upon the burden their continuance in England imposed on the northern counties; but the house had need of them,⁶ and felt in a position to induce the people to suffer this burden:

¹ Parl. Hist. ii. 686; Clarendon, (Oxford. 1807,) i. 274, ii. 15, 17; May, i. 80, 172; Whitelocke: 40.

² Clarendon, i. 279.

³ Ib. 207. The trial of Strafford forms the 8th volume of Rushworth's collection; I refer to it thus once for all.

⁴ Parl. Hist. ii. 701.

⁵ Clarendon, *ut sup.*

⁶ Baillie, Letters, i. 240.

"The Philistines are too strong for us still," said Mr. Strode; "we cannot do without our allies." The king's importunities were eluded; nay, in the distribution of the funds allotted for their pay, more favour was shown to the Scots than to the English troops, whose officers did not all inspire parliament with the same confidence.¹ Some of these took offence, but the house paid no heed to it. They did more: they resolved that the Scots had lent the English a brotherly assistance, that for the future they should be called brothers, and voted in their favour, as an indemnity and recompence, the sum of 300,000*l*. The negotiations for a definitive peace with Scotland were conducted by a committee of parliament rather than by the king's council. The leaders of both houses, particularly those of the commons, dined together every day at Mr. Pym's, at their own expense; here they were joined by the Scottish commissioners, by the authors of the principal petitions, by the most influential men in the city; here they discussed the affairs of both houses and of the state.² Such was the tendency of all powers to parliament, that the councillors of the crown, incapable or afraid of deciding the slightest question of themselves, referred to it in everything, without its needing to make any demand to that effect. A Roman-catholic priest, Goodman, had been condemned to death; the king, who dared not pardon him, placed his life at the disposal of the commons, the only means of saving it; for, notwithstanding their passions, they manifested no desire for bloodshed, (Feb. 1641.)³ The people had conceived a hatred for the queen's mother, Marie de Medicis, then a refugee in London: every day the multitude surrounded her house, loading her with insults and menaces. It was to the commons that the court applied to know whether she could remain in England, and how her safety should be cared for. They answered she had better depart, voted 10,000*l*. for her journey, and their wish was immediately carried out (May).⁴ Decisions of the courts of law, long since pronounced, came under their jurisdiction, as well as the private affairs of the king and court. The condemnation of Prynne, Burton, Bastwick, Leighton, and Lilburne, was declared illegal, and their liberation ordered, (Nov. 7,)⁵ together

¹ Whitelocke. 46.

² Clarendon, Mem. (1827,) i. 90.

³ Parl. Hist. ii. 710; State Trials, iv. 59.

⁴ Parl. Hist. ii. 788, 793; May, i. 108. ⁵ Parl. Hist. ii. 332, 731.

with a large indemnity, which, however, they never received; the common fate of past merits, soon effaced by new deserts, new necessities. The joy of the public was their only recompence: at the news of their return, a crowd of five thousand persons went to meet them; everywhere, on their route, the streets were hung with flags and laurels, and all the men wore rosemary and bays in their hats.¹ The transports of the people, the weakness of the king, everything urged on the commons to take into their sole hands the reins of the state, everything concurred to elevate them into sovereign power.

Their first attempt at the reform of institutions manifestly proclaimed, if not their sovereignty, at least their complete independence. A bill was proposed, (Jan. 19, 1641,) which prescribed the calling of a new parliament, every three years at the most. If the king did not convoke one, twelve peers assembled at Westminster might summon one without his co-operation; in default of this, the sheriffs and municipal officers were to proceed with the elections. If the sheriffs neglected to see to it, the citizens had a right to assemble and elect representatives. No parliament could be dissolved or adjourned without the consent of the two houses, till fifty days after its meeting; and to the houses alone belonged the choice of their respective speaker.² At the first news of this bill, the king quitted the silence in which he had shut himself up, and assembling both houses at Whitehall, (Jan. 23,)³ said, "I like to have frequent parliaments, as the best means to preserve that right understanding between me and my subjects, which I so earnestly desire. But to give power to sheriffs and constables, and I know not whom, to do my office, that I cannot yield to." The house only saw in these words, a new motive to press forward the adoption of the bill; none dared counsel the king to refuse it; he yielded, but in doing so, thought it due to his dignity to show the extent of his displeasure. He said, "I do not know for what you can ask, that I can hereafter make any question to yield unto you; so far, truly, I have had no great encouragement to oblige you, for you have gone on in that which concerns yourselves, and not those things which merely concern the strength of this kingdom. You have taken the government almost to pieces, and I may

¹ May, i. 80, 157; Whitelocke, 40.

² Rushworth. i. 3, 189.

³ Parl. Hist. ii. 710.

say, it is almost off its hinges. A skilful watchmaker, to make clean his watch, will take it asunder, and when it is put together again, it will go all the better, so that he leave not out one pin of it. Now, as I have done all on my part, you know what to do on yours." (Feb. 16, 1641.)¹

The houses passed a vote of thanks to the king, and forthwith proceeded in the work of reform, demanding, in successive motions, the abolition of the star chamber, of the north court, of the ecclesiastical court of high commission, and of all the extraordinary tribunals.²

No one opposed these proposals; there was no debate, even; the statement of grievances took its place. Even the men who began to fear a disorderly movement and the ulterior designs of the party, would not have dared to defend powers, odious through their acts, and in point of fact illegal, though several were invested with a legal existence. Political reform was the unanimous desire, without any reference to social condition or religious opinions; no one, as yet, troubled himself with calculations as to its precise consequences or extent. All concurred in it without questioning themselves as to their intentions and motives. Men of a soaring mind, of long and steady foresight, or already compromised by proceedings which the laws condemned, Hampden, Pym, Holles, Stapleton, contemplated the taking from the crown its fatal prerogative, to transfer the government to the house, and to fix it there irremovably. This was in their eyes the country's right, and for the people as well as for themselves the only sure guarantee. But, impelled to this design still more from necessity than from any clearly conceived principle, sanctioned by public opinion, they proceeded towards its accomplishment without declaring it. Men following in their train, violent sectaries, members as yet obscure, though very active, Cromwell, Henry Martyn, from time to time gave utterance, as against the king or the form of government, to words of a more menacing character, but they seemed, at least in the house, without consideration or credit; and even those who wondered, or were indignant at their rugged violence, were not alarmed at it. The majority of the house flattered themselves, that, after the destruction of abuses, they should re-

¹ Parl Hist. II. 716.

² Ib 717.

turn to the condition which they called that of old England, the power of the king supreme, but restricted by the periodical power of the two houses, within the limits of the law; and meanwhile, they accepted, as a temporary necessity, the almost exclusive domination of the commons, more conformable, for that matter, than they themselves imagined, with the ideas and feelings, somewhat confused in their nature, which animated them. Thus political reform, equally desired by all, though with very different views and hopes, was being accomplished with all the force of irresistible unanimity.

In religious matters it was quite different. From the very first day, an utter diversity of opinions and wishes on this subject was apparent. A petition from the city of London, backed by 15,000 signatures, demanded the entire abolition of episcopacy. (Dec. 11, 1640.)¹ Nearly at the same moment, seven hundred ecclesiastics limited themselves to requiring the reform of the temporal power of the bishops, of their despotism in the church, of the administration of its revenues; and soon after, there arrived, from various counties, nineteen petitions, signed, it is said, by more than 100,000 persons, recommending the maintenance of episcopal government.² Within the walls of parliament itself the same difference of views was manifested. The petition of the city was all but refused by the commons, being only admitted after a violent debate.³ A bill was proposed, declaring all ecclesiastics incapable of any civil function, and excluding the bishops from the house of lords; but in order to induce the commons to adopt it, (March 9 and 11, 1641,) the presbyterian party were obliged to promise they would go no further; on this condition alone did Hampden obtain the vote of lord Falkland;⁴ but the bill, when it reached the lords, was rejected, (May 24 and June 7).⁵ Furious at this, the presbyterians demanded the destruction of bishoprics and deaneries and chapters, (May 27);⁶ but the opposition was so warm that they resolved to postpone their motion. At one time, the two houses seemed agreed upon repressing the disorders that broke out on all sides in public worship, and on maintaining its legal forms, (Jan. 16);⁷ but, two days afterwards, their dissensions re-appeared. Of their so-

¹ Rushworth, i. 3, 93. ² Neal, ii. 356. ³ Baillie, Letters, i. 244.

⁴ Clarendon, i. 366.

⁵ P. Hist. ii. 794—814.

⁶ P. Hist. 814; Clarendon, i. 368

⁷ Neal, ii. p. 330.

authority, without even informing the lords, the commons sent commissioners into the counties to carry off from the churches the images, altars, crucifixes, and all the other relics of idolatry, (Jan. 23;)¹ and these messengers sanctioned by their presence the popular passions, the outbreak of which had preceded them. On their side, the lords, learning that the independents had publicly resumed their meetings, (Jan. 18,) summoned their leaders to the bar, (Jan. 19,)² and reproved them, though but timidly. No opinion, no intention on this subject, was really predominant or national. Among the partisans of episcopacy, some, small in number, but animated with the energy of faith or the pertinacity of personal interest, maintained its pretensions to divine right; others, looking upon it as a human institution, deemed it essential to monarchy, and thought the throne compromised by the power of the bishops suffering any serious blow; others, and these were numerous, would willingly, while excluding the bishops from public affairs, have retained them at the head of the church, as tradition, the laws, and state convenience seemed to them to require. In the opposite party, opinions were no less various; some were attached to episcopacy by habit, although their notions were not favourable to it; according to many of the most enlightened, no church constitution existed by divine right, or possessed absolutely legitimacy; it might vary according to time and place; the parliament was at liberty always to alter it, and public interest ought alone to decide the fate of episcopacy, respecting whose abolition or maintenance there was no fixed principle. But the presbyterians and their ministers saw in the episcopal system an idolatry condemned by the gospel, at once the successor and forerunner of popery; they repelled, with all the indignation of zealous faith, its liturgy, its form of worship, its most remote consequences; and reclaimed for the republican constitution of the church, the divine right which the bishops had usurped.

For some time after the first successes of political reform, these dissensions impeded the progress of parliament. As soon as religious questions came under discussion, the adversaries of the court, hitherto unanimous, became divided, nay, op-

¹ Neal, ii. 343.

² Ib. 342.

posed each other; the majority often varied, and no party presented itself which was on every occasion animated by the same spirit, devoted to the same designs, and capable of mastering the other sections. Pym, Hampden, the leading chiefs of the political party, took care to spare the presbyterians, and supported even their most daring motions; yet it was well known that they did not share their fanatical passions, and that what they had at heart was rather to reduce the temporal power of the bishops than to alter the constitution of the church,¹ and that in the upper house, among the most popular lords, the establishment had numerous partisans. A few prudent men advised the king to take advantage of these dissensions, and to prevent the union of the political and religious reformers, by boldly confiding to the former the affairs of the crown.

Negotiations were accordingly opened. The marquis of Hamilton, always earnest to interpose between the parties, was the most active agent in conducting them; the earl of Bedford, a moderate man, influential in the upper house, and much esteemed by the public, took a dignified share in them. The leaders of both houses often assembled at his house; he possessed their confidence, and seemed authorized to treat in their name. The king, who consented earlier than he himself could have wished, first formed a new privy council,² to which lords Bedford, Essex, Warwick, Say, Kimbolton, and some others were summoned; all of them of the popular party, some even ardently engaged in the opposition; but all high in rank. The pride of Charles, already wounded at bending even before them, did not permit him to carry the admission of his defeat lower in the scale. But the point was insisted on; the new councillors would not be separated from their friends. Each day more clearly manifested to the king the importance of those leaders of the commons whom he regarded with such bitter disdain. They, on their side, without rejecting the overtures made them, manifested little eagerness in the matter, less, however, from indifference than from perplexity: by accepting, they would, indeed, attain the principal aim of all endeavours; they would, in the name of the country, achieve legal possession of power, impose a ministry.

¹ Clarendon, *ut sup.*

² Id. l. 302.

upon the crown, and subject the king to the counsels of parliament; but then he required them to save Strafford and the church; in other words, to set at liberty their most formidable enemy, and to break with the presbyterians, their warmest friends. On both sides the perplexity was great, and distrust already too deep to yield so soon to ambition or to fear. At length, however, direct and precise proposals were made. Pym was to be chancellor of the exchequer, Hampden tutor to the prince of Wales, Holles secretary of state; St. John was at once appointed attorney-general. The ministry was to have for its leader the earl of Bedford, with the title of lord high treasurer. The previous occupants of these various offices had tendered or already given in their resignation.

But during these negotiations, carried on by both parties with little hope, perhaps also without any warm desire of success, other proposals reached the king, far more adapted to his feelings. Discontent had spread in the army; several officers, members of the lower house, too, had openly expressed it. "If," said one of them (commissary Wilmot) in the house, "all the Scotch have to do to get their money is to demand it the English soldiers will know how to follow the example." A report of this feeling soon reached the ears of the queen; her favourite, Henry Jermyn, established a connexion with the malcontents, and by his means she received them at Whitehall, and expressed her deep sympathy with their situation, the same, said she, though far less sad, far less perilous; with that of the king. Lively and ingratiating in her manners, placing her whole hope in them, she had little difficulty in persuading them that they held the destiny of the state in their hands. Secret conferences were established, in the course of which all sorts of plans were brought forward. Some proposed that the army should march to London, and forthwith deliver the king from his bondage; others, more sagacious, merely proposed that it should address to parliament a petition expressing its devotion to the king and the church; declaring that, in its opinion, the reformation of the state was completed, and requiring a stop to be put to innovation. Aid from abroad was also discussed, levies in Portugal, France; frivolous notions, without

¹ Clarendon, ii. 73, &c.; Whitelocke, 41; Sidney Papers, ii. 664.

² Whitelocke, 46

any result, but confidently advanced by hair-brained men, perhaps just risen from the dinner-table, and at all events more intent upon pushing themselves forward than upon the success of the cause. In connexion with these palace caballings, there were, in the army itself, some intrigues, more active than efficacious. The malcontents came to and fro between the camp and London, and short manuscript pamphlets circulated in the cantonments. The king himself had, after awhile, an interview with Percy, brother to the earl of Northumberland, and one of the conspirators; he discountenanced, by Percy's advice, all violent projects, all idea of bringing the army to London; but the copy of a petition was submitted to him, as menacing to the parliament as those daily received by the commons were to the crown and the church. He approved of it, and, to give influence to the leaders of the enterprise, suffered himself to be persuaded to affix his initials to it, in sign of assent.¹

The plot continued without advancing; the petition was not presented, but nothing escapes the distrust of a nation, and once their jealousy is excited, they regard designs as acts, words as designs. In public places, in taverns, a multitude of voluntary spies collected the imprudent remarks of the officers, and reported them to Pym, who had the superintendence of this department. Ere long, treachery revealed more; Goring, one of the conspirators, discovered the whole to the earl of Bedford. Nothing had been done, but the king had allowed himself to listen to propositions involving the worst that was to be feared. The leaders of the commons kept this discovery to themselves, waiting for some great occasion, to make good use of it; they did not even break off the negotiations, still carried on in the king's name with reference to their appointment to office. But, from that moment, all hesi-

¹ May, i. 97; Clarendon, i. 401; ii. 132; Whitelocke, 45; Rushworth, i. 3, 252.

² Mr. Brodie denies this fact; (iii. 109,) and thinks that Goring did not reveal the plot, till in the course of the month of April, 1641. This is, indeed, what might be concluded from Husband's Collection, p. 195, &c.; but an attentive examination of the whole of this intrigue, and a comparison of the different passages indicated in the preceding note, prove, to my mind, that the meetings of the officers commenced in the beginning of the winter of 1641, and that Pym and his friends had notice of them in the beginning of March. This is also the opinion of Mr. Lingard, x. 128. note 27.

tation disappeared from their councils; they united themselves closely with the fanatic presbyterians, the only party whose co-operation was sure, whose devotion was inexhaustible, for they alone had fixed principles, ardent passions, a revolution to accomplish, and popular force to accomplish it with. Meantime, the destruction of Strafford was irrevocably resolved, and his trial began, (March 22.)

The whole house of commons insisted upon being present to support the impeachment. With them sat, for the same purpose, commissioners from Scotland and Ireland. Eighty peers acted as judges; the bishops, upon a desire to that effect very decidedly expressed by the commons, declined being present, as is indeed the case always in trials for life or death. Above the peers, in a closed gallery, sat the king and queen, anxious to see all that passed, but desirous of concealing, the one his anguish, the other her curiosity. Around, in galleries and on raised steps, was a crowd of spectators, of both sexes, nearly all of high rank, already affected by the pomp of the spectacle, the importance of the trial, and the well-known character of the accused.

Brought by water from the Tower to Westminster, the prisoner passed through the multitude assembled at the doors, without confusion or insult; despite the general hatred, his so recent greatness, his deportment, the very terror lately attached to his name, still commanded respect. As he proceeded on, his form prematurely bowed by sickness but his eye glittering and haughty as in his youth, the crowd made way and uncovered, and he saluted them with courtesy, regarding this demeanour of the people as a good omen.² Hope had not failed him: he despised his adversaries, had well studied their charges, and did not doubt he should clear himself of the crime of high treason. The accusation of the Irish alone had for a moment astounded him, he could not understand how a kingdom till then so submissive—nay, so eager to flatter and to serve him, could thus so suddenly have changed.

The second day, an incident showed him that he had misunderstood the situation and the difficulties of his defence. "I hope," said he, "I shall easily repel the imputations of my malicious enemies." At these words, Pym, wh

was managing the trial, angrily took him up. "It is to the commons this insult is addressed; and I pronounce it a crime thus to charge them with malicious enmity." Strafford, agitated at this, fell upon his knees, apologized, and from that moment, perfectly calm and self-possessed, allowed to escape him not one sign of anger or even of impatience, not a word which could be turned against him.

For seventeen days, he, unaided, against thirteen accusers who relieved one another, argued the charges which they brought forward. A great many were incontestably proved, convicting him of injustice and tyranny. But others, foolishly exaggerated or blindly credited by hatred, were easily repelled, and none, in truth, came within the legal definition of high treason. Strafford applied all his efforts to dispossess them of this character, speaking with magnanimity of his imperfections, of his frailties, opposing a modest dignity to the violence of his adversaries, and proving, without contumely, the passion-born illegality of their proceedings. Disgraceful obstacles impeded his defence; his counsel, obtained with great difficulty and despite the commons, were not allowed to speak as to facts, nor to examine the witnesses; permission to bring forward witnesses for the defence was not granted him till three days before the trial commenced, though most of them were in Ireland. At every opportunity, he claimed his right, thanked his judges if they consented to acknowledge it, made no complaint when they refused, and simply replied to his enemies, who were angry at the delays created by his able defence: "I have as much right, I believe, to defend my life, as others have to assail it."

So much energy embarrassed and humiliated the accusers. Twice (March 25, April 9,) the commons summoned the lords to proceed more rapidly with a trial, which, they said, caused them to lose time highly precious to the country.¹ The lords refused; the success of the accused gave them back a little energy. When the case for the prosecution was over, before Strafford's counsel had opened their lips, or he himself had resumed his defence, the impeachment committee felt themselves conquered, at least as to the proof of high treason. The excitement of the commons became extreme:

State Trials, iii. 1420.

² Parl. Hist. ii. 743.

favoured by the letter of the law and his own fatal genius, this great criminal, then, was about to escape them, and reform, scarcely born, would once more have to sustain the attack of its most dangerous enemy. A sudden and bold stroke was resolved upon. Sir Arthur Haslerig, a hard, coarse-minded man, proposed to declare Strafford guilty and to condemn him by act of parliament, (April 10, 1641.) This proceeding, which dispensed the judges from all law, was not without example, though its precedents all belonged to periods of tyranny, and had even been denounced soon after their occurrence, as iniquitous. Some notes found among the papers of the secretary of state, Vane, and given to Pym by his son,¹ were produced as supplementary proof sufficient to make out high treason. They imputed to Strafford that he had advised the king, in open council, to employ the Irish army to quell England. The words they attributed to him, though contradicted by the evidence of several members of the council, and in themselves susceptible of a less odious interpretation, were too conformable with his general conduct, and with the maxims he had often declared, not to produce a strong impression on all minds. The bill immediately obtained a first reading. Some thought they were sacrificing the law to justice, others justice to necessity.

All this while the trial went on, for the commons would not give up any chance against the accused, nor allow the peril of the act of parliament to release him from that of the legal judgment. Before his counsel began to speak on the question of law, Strafford resumed his defence, (April 13,) he spoke long and with marvellous eloquence, applying himself to prove that by no law could any one of his actions be charged as high treason. Conviction every moment grew stronger in the minds of his judges, and he ably followed its progress, adapting his words to the impressions he saw springing up, deeply agitated, but not allowing his emotion to keep him from perceiving and marking what was passing around him. "My Lords," he said, in conclusion, "these gentlemen tell me they speak in defence of the commonwealth against my arbitrary laws; give me leave to say it, I speak

¹ His name was Harry Vane, the same as his father's. It is he who will always be referred to hereafter as one of the leaders of the independent party.

in defence of the commonwealth, against their arbitrary treason. . . My lords, do we not live by laws, and must we be punished by laws before they be made? My lords, if this crime, which they call arbitrary treason, had been marked by any discerner of the law, the ignorance thereof should be no excuse for me; but if it be no law at all, how can it in rigour or strictness itself condemn me? Beware you do not wake these sleeping lions, by the searching out some neglected moth-eaten records; they may one day tear you and your posterity to pieces. It was your ancestors' care to chain them up within the barricadoes of statutes; be not you ambitious to be more skilful and curious than your forefathers in the art of killing. For my poor self, were it not for your lordships' interest, and the interest of a saint in heaven, who hath left me these sacred pledges on earth,"—at this his breath stopped, and he shed tears abundantly on mentioning his wife, but looking up again immediately, he continued—"I should never take the pains to keep up this ruinous cottage of mine; it is laden with such infirmities, that, in truth, I have no great pleasure to carry it about with me any longer." Again he stopped, as if seeking an idea: "My lords,—my lords,—my lords, something more I had to say, but my voice and spirits fail me; only I do, in all humility and submission, cast myself down before your lordships' feet; and whether your judgment in my case be either for life or death, it shall be righteous in my eyes, and received with a *Te Deum laudamus*."

The auditory were seized with pity and admiration. Pym was about to answer; Strafford looked at him; menace gleamed in the immobility of his mien; his pale and protruded lip bore the expression of passionate scorn; Pym was agitated, and paused; his hands trembled, and he sought without finding it a paper which was just before his eyes. It was the answer he had prepared, and which he read without being listened to by any one, himself hastening to finish an harangue foreign to the feelings of the assembly, and which he had great difficulty in delivering.¹

Emotion passes away, anger remains! that of Pym and his friends was at its height. They hastened the second reading of the bill of attainder (April 14). In vain did Selden,

¹ State Trials, iii. 1469.

the oldest and most illustrious of the defenders of liberty, Holborne, one of Hampden's counsel in the affair of ship-money, and several others,¹ oppose it. It was now the only resource of the party; for they clearly saw that the lords would not condemn Strafford as judges and in the name of the law. They even wished the trial to be at once suspended, that Strafford's counsel should not be heard; and such was their violence, that they talked of summoning to the bar and punishing "those insolent counsel who dared to undertake the defence of a man whom the house had declared guilty of high treason." The lords resisted these outrageous propositions; Strafford's counsel were heard, but the commons did not answer them, did not even go to hear them, saying it was beneath their dignity to dispute with lawyers; and four days after, notwithstanding the active opposition of lord Digby, till then one of Strafford's most furious assailants, the bill of attainder passed its third reading, (Apr. 21.)²

At this intelligence the afflicted king only thought how he might save the earl, no matter at what price: "Be sure," he wrote to him, "on my royal word, that you shall not suffer, either in your life, or in your fortune, or in your honour." Every engine was set at work with all the blind haste of fear and grief. The chiefs of the commons were offered all sorts of concessions; a plot was concerted for the escape of the prisoner. But the plot injured the negotiations, the negotiations the plot. The earl of Bedford, who appeared disposed to some compliance, died suddenly. The earl of Essex, in answer to Hyde, who was speaking of the insurmountable resistance that the king's conscience would oppose to the bill, said: "The king is obliged to conform himself and his own understanding to the advice and conscience of his parliament."³ Sir William Balfour, the governor of the Tower, was offered 20,000*l.* and one of Strafford's daughters in marriage for his son, if he would aid his escape; he refused. He was ordered to receive into the prison, under the name of guards, a hundred chosen men, commanded by Captain Billingsley, a discontented officer; he informed the commons of the offer and of the order. Every day witnessed the formation and failure of some new plan for the preservation of the earl.

State Trials, iii. 1469.

² Clarendon, i. 370, *et passim*.

³ Ib. i. 377.

At last, the king, contrary to Strafford's own judgment, caused both houses to be summoned; and, acknowledging the earl's faults and promising that he would never employ him again, not even as a constable, declared, at the same time, that no argument, no fear, would ever make him consent to his death, (May 1.)

But the hatred of the commons was inflexible, and more daring than the king's grief: they had foreseen his resistance, and prepared the means of overcoming it. Ever since the bill of attainder had been carried to the upper house, the multitude assembled daily round Westminster Hall, armed with swords, knives, and sticks, shouting, 'Justice! Justice!' and menacing the lords who delayed their vote.¹ Arundel² was obliged to get out of his carriage, and, hat in hand, beg of the multitude to retire, undertaking to press the accomplishment of their wishes. Fifty-nine members of the commons had voted against the bill; their names were placarded in the streets, with these words: *Here are the Straffordians, traitors to their country!* The pulpit sent forth similar denunciations; the ministers preached and prayed for the punishment of *a great delinquent*. The lords, acting upon a message from the king, complained of these disorders to the commons, (May 3;) the commons returned no answer.³ Yet the bill still remained in suspense. A decisive blow, kept in reserve for such an occasion, was resolved upon: Pym, summoning fear to the aid of vengeance, from his place in the house, denounced the plot of the court and the officers to raise the army against the parliament, (May 3.)⁴ Some of those implicated absconded, which confirmed every suspicion. A wild terror took possession of the house and of the people. It was resolved that the doors should be closed, and that all members' letters should be opened. (May 11.)⁵ Absurd alarms still further added to the agitation of men's minds. A report was spread in the city (May 15) that the house of commons, having been undermined, was about to be blown up; the militia took to their arms; an immense multitude rushed to Westminster. Sir Walter Earl hastened to inform the house of the rumour; as he was speaking, Mr. Middleton and Mr.

¹ Parl. Hist. ii, 755; Whitelocke, 45.

² Lord Montgomery, according to Whitelocke, ib.

³ Parl. Hist. ii 778.

⁴ Ib. 776.

⁵ Ib. 788.

People, remarkably corpulent men, rose suddenly to listen to him; the floor creaked: "The house is blowing up!" cried several of the members, rushing out of the hall, which was immediately thronged with the populace; and there was another scene of the same nature in the course of the week.¹ In the midst of so much excitement, measures skilfully planned were establishing the empire of the commons and the success of their designs. In imitation of the Scottish covenant, an oath of union, for the defence of the protestant religion and the public liberties, was taken by both houses; the commons even wished to extend it to the people; and on the lords declining to sanction this, declared whoever should refuse to take it incapable of holding any office in church or state.² Finally, to secure the future from any peril, a bill was proposed, declaring that this parliament could not be dissolved without its own consent, (May 7.)³ Even this daring measure scarcely occasioned any surprise; the necessity of giving a guarantee to loans, now, it was said, more difficult to obtain than ever, served as a pretext; the general excitement stifled all objection. The lords attempted to amend the bill, but in vain: the upper house was conquered; and the judges now extended to its weakness the sanction of their own cowardice; they declared that within the meaning of the law the crimes of Strafford really constituted high treason.⁴ The bill of attainder was submitted to a last debate: thirty-four of the lords who had attended the trial absented themselves; among those present, twenty-six voted for the bill, nineteen against it, (May 7.)⁵ nothing more was needed but the king's consent.

Charles still resisted, thinking himself incapable of such dishonour. He sent for Holles, Strafford's brother-in-law, and who, on this ground, had taken no part in the prosecution. "What can be done to save him?" he asked, with anguish. Holles advised that Strafford should solicit the king for a reprieve, and that the king should go in person to present his petition to parliament, in a speech which Holles himself drew up on the spot: at the same time, he promised to do all in his power to induce his friends to be satisfied with the earl's

¹ Parl. Hist. ii. 782.

² Ib. 778; Neal, ii. 222.

³ Clarendon, i. 409; Whitelocke, 45; Parl. Hist. ii. 786.

⁴ Parl. Hist. ii. 737.

⁵ Ib.

banishment: the matter thus arranged, they parted. Already, it is said, the efforts of Holles had met with some success, when the queen, ever hostile to Strafford, alarmed at the outbreaks of the people, each day more violent, and moreover, it is reported, fearing, from the information of some of her confidants, that to save his life, the earl had engaged to reveal all he knew of her intrigues, came and beset the king with her suspicions and terrors:¹ her alarm was so great that she wished to fly, to return to France, and she was already making preparations for her departure.² Moved by the tears of his wife, incapable of deciding for himself, Charles first assembled a privy council, and then the bishops. Juxon, bishop of London, alone counselled him to obey his conscience; all the others, the bishop of Lincoln, in particular, an intriguing prelate, long opposed to the court, urged him to sacrifice an individual to the throne, his conscience as a man to his conscience as a king.³ He had scarce quitted the council chamber, when a letter from Strafford was delivered to him, (May 9:) "Sire," wrote the earl, "after a long and hard struggle, I have come to the only resolution befitting me; all private interest should give way to the happiness of your sacred person, and of the state. I entreat you to remove; by attending to this bill, the obstacle which prevents a happy concord between you and your subjects. Sire, my consent herein shall acquit you more to God than all the world can do beside. To a willing man there is no injury done. By God's grace, my soul, about to quit this body, forgives all men all things, with infinite contentment. I only ask that you would grant to my poor son and his three sisters, as much kindness, neither more nor less, as their unfortunate father shall be deemed to merit, according as he shall one day ere long be held guilty or innocent."⁴

The next day, the secretary of state, Carleton, went, on the part of the king, to inform Strafford that he had consented to the fatal bill. (May 10.) The earl seemed somewhat surprised, and, for his only answer, raising his hands to heaven,

¹ Burnet's Own Times.

² See a letter of M. de Montreuil, the French minister, dated the 23rd May 1641; Mazure, *Hist. de la Revolution de 1688*, iii. 422.

³ Clarendon. i. 398.

⁴ State Trials. iii. 1516.

exclaimed, "*Nolite confidere principibus et filiis hominum, quia non est salus in illis.*"

Instead of going in person, as he had promised Holles, to beg a reprieve of parliament, the king contented himself with sending by the prince of Wales, a letter, which concluded with this postscript, "If he must die, it would be a charity to spare him till Saturday." The houses read the letter twice, and without noticing this cold request, ordered the execution for the next day. (May 11.)

The governor of the Tower, who was to accompany Strafford,² urged him to take a carriage, to escape the violence of the people: "No, Master lieutenant," answered he, "I dare look death in the face, and I hope the people too. Have you a care that I do not escape, and I care not how I die, whether by the hand of the executioner, or by the madness and fury of the people; if that may give them better content, it is all one to me:" and he went out on foot, preceding the guards, and looking around on all sides, as if he had been marching at the head of an army. As he passed the chamber where Laud was imprisoned, he stopped; the evening before he had sent to request him to be at the window, and to bless him on his way: "My Lord," he bowed and said, "your prayers and your blessing." The archbishop extended his arms towards him, but of a mind less firm than his friend's, and that enervated by age, he fell back senseless. "Farewell, my lord," said Strafford, as he moved on, "God protect your innocence!" Arrived at the scaffold, he ascended without hesitation, followed by his brother, the ministers of the church, and several of his friends, knelt down an instant, then rose and addressed the people: "I desire," said he, "for this kingdom, every earthly prosperity; while I lived, this was my constant endeavour; dying, it is my only wish. But I entreat each and all of you, who listen to me, to examine yourselves seriously, your hands on your hearts, whether the beginning reformation of a kingdom should be written in characters of blood; think over this when you go to your homes. Never let me be so unhappy, that the least drop of my blood should rise up in judgment against any of you; but I fear you are in a wrong way." He knelt down

¹ "Put not your trust in princes, nor in the sons of men, for in them there is no salvation."—White Locke, 46.

² Parl. Hist. ii. 760.

again, and prayed for a quarter of an hour; then, turning to his friends, he took leave of them all, shaking hands with each, and giving each some advice. "Now," said he, "I have nigh done! one stroke will make my wife husbandless, my dear children fatherless, and my poor servants masterless, and will separate me from my dear brother and all my friends! But let God be to you and them all in all!" As he disrobed, "I thank God," added he, "I am not afraid of death, nor daunted with any discouragement rising from my fears; but do as cheerfully put off my doublet at this time as ever I did when I went to bed." He called the executioner, forgave him, prayed an instant, laid his head on the block, and gave the signal himself. His head fell; the executioner held it up to the people, saying, "God save the king!" Violent acclamations burst forth; several bands of men spread through the city, celebrating their victory with loud shouts; but others retired silently, filled with doubt and uneasiness as to the justice of the wish they had just seen fulfilled.¹

Disturbed by the exhibition of the latter feeling, the commons did all in their power to repress it; nothing more irritates conquerors than to find a dead enemy still dangerous. Mr. Taylor, for having said, in private conversation, that they had committed a murder with the sword of justice, was sent to the Tower, expelled the house, and declared incapable of ever taking his seat again, (May 27.)² Lord Digby had published his speech against the bill of attainder; the house forbade its circulation, and had it burnt by the common hangman, (July 13.)³ Never had their strength appeared so great, so firmly established; the king consenting to the death of the earl, had also adopted, almost without looking at it, the bill which deprived him of the right of dissolving parliament without its own consent. Yet the commons still needed security; and the more their power increased, the more they felt impelled towards tyranny. The king, in delivering up Strafford to them, had lowered himself in their eyes, but given them no greater confidence in him, and hatred, still deeper than before, redoubled their mistrust. A royalist party, besides that of the court, began, moreover, to form amongst them. Pym,

¹ State Trials, iii. 1581; Warwick's Mem. (1702) 164.

² Parl. Hist. ii. 815.

³ Ib. 754.

Hampton and Hales found themselves obliged to ally themselves more and more closely with the sectaries, and this alliance displeased even the warm friends of liberty. "To what purpose," they asked, "embarrass political reform with doubtful questions? In matters of worship and discipline, opinions differ; against absolute power, England is unanimous; that is the only enemy we should hunt down without mercy." Sometimes this view of things prevailed, and the house, resuming the examination of grievances, recovered its unanimity. The abolition of the star chamber, of the northern court, the court of high commission, of all inferior tribunals, was definitively pronounced, and the king, after two days' hesitation, gave his assent, (July 5).¹ Political reform, such, at least, as it had at first been wished for and conceived, seemed accomplished; but to what purpose set it down in statutes, if the carrying it out was to be left to its enemies? The king's hesitations, the rumours of plots, the defections perceived or foreseen in the army and the parliament, awakened alarm; to lose power, the parliamentary leaders felt would be to ruin themselves and their cause; to retain it, the assistance of the people was necessary, and the people, devoted to the presbyterians, claimed in its turn a share of the triumph. All the motions against the church re-appeared; the Scots even began openly to solicit for uniformity of worship in the two countries. These attempts once more failed; and then ill success, the perplexity into which both houses were thrown by so many passions and heterogeneous designs, gave to their proceedings an appearance of uncertainty and weariness, out of which some promised themselves repose. But the religious struggle became more and more decided; the sectaries grew bolder, the church was more and more shaken. Even in the upper house, her firmest support, everything attested her decline: the spiritual lords were no longer, according to ancient custom, mentioned separately at the head of the bills; the clerk of the house, when reading them, affected to turn his back to the bench of bishops, and in public ceremonies the temporal lords assumed the precedence.² These symptoms did not escape the presbyterian party, who incessantly renewed their attacks, took the lead of the poli-

¹ Parl. Hist. ii. 853.

² Neal, ii. 410, 411.

tical reformers, whom they maintained in the possession of power, and, notwithstanding apparent reverses, daily advanced towards success.

The king, all at once, recalled to mind his project of visiting Scotland, where the execution of the treaty of peace, at last about to be concluded, called, he said, for his presence. At the same time it was stated that the queen, giving out ill health as the pretext, was preparing to depart for the continent. The malcontent army lay on the road the king would take, and the queen's connexions with the continent had long been matter of speculation. This double journey, sudden and simultaneous, gave distrust the fuel it required. Its doubts were quite legitimate. Without power or influence in London, surrounded by useless courtiers and panic-struck councillors, Charles had turned his thoughts towards the kingdom of his fathers, and the absolute monarchs of Europe. In Scotland, he intended, by yielding all demands, both as to church and state, to gain the good-will of the people, and to load the lords with favours. In the army, a visit from him, and the conciliatory department he contemplated, could not fail to increase the number of his partisans. As to the continent, his views were less precise; but without imagining or even foreseeing war, he already sought money and allies. The commons did not give utterance to their suspicions; but they required that the queen should not leave London, and that the king should defer his departure (June 26). Charles exhibited some displeasure at this, affecting to regard the request as an unmeaning caprice. To make it supposed that he attached no importance to his answer, he referred the commons for it to the Scottish commissioners, who, he said, solicited him to hasten his journey, and to the queen herself. The Scots willingly agreed to a delay; and the queen readily promised not to depart.¹ Reassured for a moment, the commons pressing, urged the disbanding of the army, hitherto purposely retarded. Letters from the house guaranteed the troops the prompt payment of their demands. To provide for this, some zealous citizens had their plate melted; fresh loans were ordered, new taxes imposed.² But the dis-

¹ Parl. Hist. ii. 840, *et seq.*

² May, i. 105; Parl. Hist. ii. 841. The interest demanded for this loan was fixed at ten per cent.

landing proceeded slowly, from the want of money, and also from the difficulties interposed by many of the officers.¹ The king secretly congratulated himself upon this circumstance; it made the commons resume their anxieties. The delay agreed upon had now expired. The commons solicited another, but without success (Aug. 8);² the king announced that he was about to depart. The house started the project of demanding that a regent should be appointed during his absence, that public business might not be suspended; but the idea was not acted upon.³ The king contented himself with naming the earl of Essex captain-general south of Trent, and departed on the 10th of August, full of hopes which he could not help giving vague utterance to, but of which no one could conceive the grounds.

The house was not long in perceiving that they only lost time by sitting uncertain and inactive during his absence. It was much more important to them to watch closely their adversaries, and to refresh the zeal of their partisans in the counties. After a fortnight of barren sittings, they resolved to adjourn (Aug. 27).⁴ Many of the members wished to look after their private concerns, or to take some repose; but the leaders allowed themselves no rest whatever. A committee under the direction of Hampden was sent to Scotland, to remain near the king, and watch over the interests of parliament.⁵ Another committee, numerous and invested with large powers, sat at Westminster in the interval of the two sessions; Pym acted as its chairman. The house of lords took similar measures.⁶ A great many members spread themselves over the country, eager to diffuse their sentiments and their fears. Both parties, under the appearance of a truce, were seeking abroad new strength, both meditating new contests.

In passing through the English army, which was disbanding, and the Scottish army, which was returning home, the king did not think it advisable to stop long. Still his attempts with the soldiers, particularly among the officers, were so

¹ Clarendon, i. 422.

² Parl. Hist. ii. 807.

³ Ib. 802.

⁴ The recess was to last from Sept. 8 to Oct. 20; Parl. Hist. ii. 904.

⁵ Parl. Hist. ii. 902. This committee was composed of six members—namely, the earl of Bedford, lord Howard, sir William Armyne, sir Philip Stapleton, Nathaniel Fiennes, and John Hampden.

⁶ Ib.

public that lord Holland, who presided over the disbanding, wrote an anxious letter on the subject to the earl of Essex (Aug. 16), adding, that on his return to London he would tell him more. Arrived in Edinburgh, Charles made to the parliament and church of Scotland all the concessions they demanded: triennial parliaments, the abrogation of the ancient prerogatives of the crown, the prosecution of the principal opponents of the covenant, even the intervention of parliament in the nomination of the privy council, nothing was refused. The king lent himself to the presbyterian worship, with a gravity which had nothing of the air of mere complaisance about it, assiduously attending their frequent prayers, and listening attentively to their long sermons; and, whether laymen or ecclesiastics, noblemen or citizens, the chiefs of the covenanters were treated with marked favour; titles, offices, promises, pensions were lavished upon them.

On a sudden, rumour went through the city (early in October) that the most influential noblemen in parliament, Hamilton and Argyle, had quitted it, followed by their friends, and had retired to Kinneil castle, the residence of the earl of Lanark, Hamilton's brother, to escape the danger of an arrest and even of assassination. The astonishment at this was extreme; all asked, none could give an answer, what had inspired the fugitives with such fears, the king with such designs. Strange conjectures spread abroad; the king haughtily complained of them as an insult, and demanded of parliament the exclusion of Hamilton, till his honour was vindicated. The parliament, firm but circumspect, formed no sudden decision, but ordered an inquiry. Numerous witnesses were heard; the committee made its report; it declared, without going into particulars, that there was no occasion of reparation to the king, of fear to the fugitives. The two noblemen returned to parliament, remained silent, as did Charles, on what had passed, and from them the public learned nothing further.

Neither party wished it should be better informed; out meantime, the matter had somehow been explained to it. At the time the king, in order to gain over Scotland against England, was making so many concessions, he was meditating

the overthrow of his enemies in both kingdoms. Convinced that the judges could not do otherwise than condemn as treason the correspondence of the English malcontents with the Scottish covenanters, which preceded and perhaps produced the last invasion, he had come to Scotland himself to seek for proofs, purposing, on his return, to bring against the leaders of the commons that accusation which Strafford, anticipated by their more rapid movement, had not been able even to announce. A young and daring nobleman, at first devoted to the covenant, but since restored to the king's favour, the earl of Montrose, had engaged to procure for him the so anxiously desired documents. Relying upon this promise, Charles commenced his journey to the North; but before he arrived, a letter in cipher, intercepted by Argyle, had excited the suspicion of the Scots, and the king found Montrose in prison.

Animated by the danger and burning for revenge, the earl sent him word that if he could see him he would acquaint him with his real enemies, and their past machinations. By the aid of some trusty friends, Montrose secretly quitted his prison, went at night to the king's bedchamber, told him all he knew, accused Hamilton of having, with Argyle, taken part in the plans of the malcontents, assured the king that their papers would furnish proofs of this, and finally persuaded him to secure at once the persons of these noblemen, and to have them summarily dispatched if they resisted. Ever ready to adopt daring resolves, and without thinking of the effect which so violent an act could not fail to produce on the minds of the people whom he was seeking to conciliate, Charles consented to everything; the plot proceeded simultaneously with the concessions, and everything was ready for its execution, when the two lords, warned in time, caused the whole thing to fail by their public departure.

The Scottish parliament wisely did its best to stifle the affair; it no longer feared the peril, and did not wish to endanger what it had just obtained, by pushing matters to extremity. The king himself, to conceal his designs and their want of success, raised Hamilton to the rank of duke, Argyle to that of marquis; Lesley was created earl of Leven;

¹ Hardwicke's State Papers, ii. 299; Clarendon, i. 483; Burnet, *Memoirs of the Hamiltons*, 148—171; Baillie's Letters, i. 320, *et seq.*; Laing, *History of Scotland*, iii. 228, and 347; Brodie, iii. 142, 150.

but Hampden and the English committee, well informed of all that had taken place, hastened to send word of it to London, where the parliament was about to meet. Fear seized the party there.¹ With all their distrust they had not anticipated such dangers as these, and the leaders thought their former relations with the Scottish insurgents had been pardoned, together with the rebellion itself, by the last treaty of peace. At this indication of the king's obstinately vindictive intentions, men, otherwise moderate, thought themselves irredeemably compromised. Mr. Hyde meeting lord Essex and lord Holland, who were anxiously discussing the news, ridiculed their fears, and reminded them of what they themselves thought of Hamilton and Argyle a year before: "Both the times and the court," they replied, "are much altered since that."² On the first day of their assembling, the commons applied to the earl of Essex for a guard, rendered indispensable, they said, for the safety of parliament. It was at once granted. In conferences held at lord Holland's house at Kensington, the leaders of both houses communicated to each other the information they from time to time received, and their suspicions, and deliberated what was to be done, all of them agitated, all impelled by their uneasiness to dare everything. "If there be a plot of the king against us," said lord Newport, "his wife and children are here;"³ and their alarms were all the greater, because they dared not make use of them to stir up the people, for nothing having transpired in Scotland, in London nothing could be revealed.

In the midst of this secret agitation, came all of a sudden the news, (Nov. 1,) that an insurrection, as general as violent, had covered Ireland with massacre, and threatened with the most imminent danger the protestant religion and the parliament. The Irish catholics, leaders and people, had risen in every direction, claiming liberty for their worship and their country, invoking the name of the queen, even of the king, showing a commission which they had, as they said, received from him, and announcing the project of delivering themselves and the throne from the English puritans, their common oppressors. The conspiracy, long preparing all over the kingdom, was disclosed solely by chance, and that only at Dublin, (Oct. 22.) on

¹ Evelyn's Mem., ii. Append. p. 40, 40; Parl. Hist. ii. 914.

² Clarendon, i. 404.

³ Parl. Hist. ii. 984.

the evening next before its explosion, so that there was scarcely time to secure from the outbreak the seat of government. Everywhere else it met with very little obstacle; on all sides the protestants of Ireland were attacked unawares, ejected from their houses, hunted down, slaughtered, exposed to all the perils, all the torments that religious and patriotic hatred could invent against heretics, foreigners, and tyrants. The most fearful and distressing accounts arrived of the miseries they were subjected to; of infinite murders, of sufferings altogether unprecedented; and the evil was indeed so great, that it might be exaggerated, according to men's fears or designs, without offending truth or exhausting credulity.¹ A half savage people, passionately attached to the barbarism which their oppressors made matter of reproach, while they prevented them from quitting it, had seized with transport the hope of deliverance which the dissensions of their tyrants offered them. Eager to avenge in a day ages of outrage and misery, they with a proud joy committed excesses which struck their ancient masters with horror and dismay. The English authorities were utterly without the means of resistance; in its hatred to Strafford and the crown, solely occupied by the design of establishing liberty in England, parliament had forgotten that in Ireland it desired to keep up tyranny. The treasury there had been thoroughly exhausted, martial law abolished, the army reduced to an insignificant corps, the royal power disarmed. It had even, contrary to the king's wish, forbidden the disbanded Irish troops to pass into foreign service;² and these had accordingly spread over the country, adding their force to the insurrection. Finally, though the earl of Leicester had been appointed successor to Strafford,

¹ May, (ii. 4,) makes the number of protestants who were massacred, 200,000; Clarendon reduces it to 40,000 or 50,000, (ii. 227.) It is probable, from the correspondence of the judges then in Ireland, and the inquiry made into the subject in 1644, that even the last account is exaggerated. Yet this inquiry, which Mr. Lingard (x. note A. p. 463, 469) considers as decisive, deserves no confidence; not only was it made three years after the outbreak, but at an epoch when the royalist party reigned absolute in Ireland, and had just made peace with the catholics; it had evidently for its object to soften as much as possible the excesses of the insurgents, the sufferings of the protestants, and thus to excuse the alliance the king was on the point of contracting.

² Rushworth, i. 3, 361.

there was as yet no viceroy resident in Ireland; the public business was entrusted to two judges, destitute of capacity or influence,¹ and whose presbyterian zeal had alone procured for them this difficult office.

A cry of terror and fierce hate arose against popery all over England; every protestant thought himself in danger. The king, who had received the news in Scotland, hastened to communicate it to the two houses, announcing certain measures which, with the assistance of the Scots, he had already taken to repress the rebellion, but leaving all future management of the affair entirely to the care of parliament.² Charles had nothing to do with the insurrection, and the pretended commission produced by Sir Phelim O'Neil was a gross forgery; but his known hatred of the puritans, the confidence he had more than once manifested in the catholics, the intrigues that for the last three months he had been carrying on in Ireland, to secure strongholds and soldiers there in case of need,³ the promises made by the queen, had persuaded the Irish that they might, without fearing a sincere disavowal, make use of his name. Ireland in rebellion, Charles hoped so great a danger would render the parliament more tractable; and without supporting the rebels, without contemplating for a moment any alliance with them, he was not, like his people, seized with anger and fear at their revolt; he was in no haste to repress it, and left the affair to parliament at once to throw upon it all the blame for any mischances, and to remove from himself the suspicion of complicity; perhaps, also, to relieve himself in the eyes of his catholic subjects from responsibility for the rigour they would be subjected to.

But cunning is of no avail against the passions of a people; he who will not affect to adopt cannot deceive them. The leaders of the commons, more skilful and better situated, only thought of working them to their own profit. Their uneasiness had now disappeared, for the English people thought themselves fallen into a peril analogous to their own.

¹ Sir William Parsons, and sir John Borlase. ² Clarendon, i. 467.

³ Carte, *Life of Ormond*, i. 132; iii. 30; Clarendon, *State Papers*, ii. 337; Antrim's information, in the appendix to Clarendon's *History of the Irish Rebellion*. The testimony given by Antrim, more especially as to facts, does not, however, in my opinion, deserve the confidence placed in it by Lingard, x. 154.

Prompt to accept the power offered them by the king, notwithstanding the pomp of their declarations and the violence of their threats, the care of repressing the rebellion occupied them but little; the assistance, both in troops and money, sent to Ireland, was weak, tardy, and ill-arranged. To England alone were addressed all their speeches, all their real action, and by a step as decisive as unexpected, they resolved to engage it inextricably.

Shortly after the opening of parliament, a committee had been charged to prepare a general remonstrance, setting forth all the grievances of the kingdom, and the means of redressing them. But the reform had been so rapid that they had neglected to give much prominence to the complaints: most of the grievances, the political grievances at least, had disappeared; the committee took no further heed to its commission, and no one appeared to think any more about it.

It now suddenly (towards the beginning of November) received orders to resume its labours, and to make a report without delay.¹ In a few days the remonstrance was drawn up and submitted to the house. It was no longer, according to the first intention, an exposition of actual and pressing abuses, and of the unanimous wishes of the country, but a dark picture of past evils, of old grievances, of all the delinquencies of the king, contrasted with the merits of the parliament, and the obstacles it had surmounted, the perils it had encountered, and particularly those which still threatened it and necessitated the utmost efforts of its power; it was, in short, a sort of appeal to the people, addressed more especially to the fanatical presbyterians, and which, fomenting the passions that the Irish rebellion had re-kindled, excited them to devote themselves unreservedly to the house of commons, alone capable of saving them from popery, the bishops, and the king.

When the remonstrance was first read, many murmurs rose against it; an act so hostile, without public grounds, without any direct or apparent aim, excited in many members, till then far from friendly to the court, surprise and suspicion; they complained of the bitterness of the language, the futile indignation against grievances already redressed,

of the rudeness shown towards the king, the hopes held out to the sectaries. What were the hidden designs, the unknown perils that required such violent measures? If the remonstrance was destined for the king alone, what good could be expected from it? If it was meant for the people, what right had its promoters to appeal from the house to the people. The leaders of the party said little in reply, not being able to say all; but in their private conversations, they ardently laboured to gain votes, protesting that they only wanted to intimidate the court and frustrate its intrigues; and that if the remonstrance was only adopted, they would not publish it. This was not without effect, for distrust was now so catching, that men, otherwise of a moderate turn, received it when suggested without violence, and in the language of reason. In a few days (Nov. 21), at the moment when the house, after a sitting of several hours, was about to rise, the leaders moved that the remonstrance should be immediately put to the vote; they had reckoned their numbers, and thought themselves sure of success; but lord Falkland, Hyde, Colepepper, Palmer, opposed the motion warmly, insisting that it should be adjourned till the next day, to which the house willingly assented. "Why," said Cromwell to lord Falkland, "would you have it put off? the day would quickly have determined it." "There would not have been time enough," said lord Falkland, "for sure it would take some debate." "A very sorry one," answered Cromwell, with real or affected confidence. Opened the next day at three in the afternoon, when night came the debate seemed scarcely begun. It was no longer the court and the country contending; for the first time, there were now engaged two parties, if not both national, at least both sprung from the body of the nation; both putting themselves forward as the upholders of public interests and feelings, both reckoning worthy and independent citizens among their followers. Common hopes had united them; opposite fears divided them; each sagaciously foresaw the result which would follow the triumph of its adversaries, but mistook that which its own victory would produce. They struggled with unexampled rancour, and were all the more obstinate that they still observed decorum, and dared not loudly accuse each other, according to the dictates of their suspicions. The hours passed on; fatigue drove away

the weak, the indifferent, and the aged; even one of the king's ministers, the secretary of state, Nicholas, left the house before the close of the debate. "This," said, sir Benjamin Rudyard, "will be the verdict of a starving jury." At length, towards midnight they divided: one hundred and fifty-nine votes adopted the remonstrance, one hundred and forty-eight were against it. Forthwith Hampden rose, and moved that it should be printed at once. "We knew it!" many cried; "you want to raise the people and get rid of the lords." "The house," said Mr. Hyde, "is not in the habit of thus publishing its decisions; in my opinion the doing so is not lawful, and would produce mischievous effects; if it be adopted, let me be allowed to protest." "I protest," said Mr. Palmer. "I protest, I protest!" re-echoed their friends. This, again, with the other party, gave rise to astonishment and indignation; protests, in use with the lords, were unknown to the commons: Pym rose to demonstrate their illegality and danger; he was interrupted by invectives; he persisted, and was answered by threats. The whole house was on its legs, and several members, their hands on their swords, seemed on the point of beginning a civil war within the walls of parliament. Two hours passed away, the tumult recommencing with every attempt to carry a resolution. At last Hampden, after exploring mildly but gravely this humiliating disorder, proposed that the house should rise, and adjourn the further discussion of the question till the afternoon. They separated. "Well," said lord Falkland to Cromwell, as he was going out, "was there a debate?" "I'll take your word another time," said Cromwell; and whispered him in the ear with some asseveration—"had the remonstrance been rejected, I would, to-morrow, have sold everything I possess, and never seen England more; and I know many other honest men of the same resolution."

The afternoon sitting was comparatively tranquil; the royalists had given up all hope of victory, and their adversaries had seen themselves so near losing it, that they did not desire to renew the struggle. They had announced the impeachment of the protestants; but Mr. Hyde had friends in the house who refused to give him up. Mr. Palmer, indeed.

¹ Clarendon, i. 43, 285; Warwick's Mem.; May, ii. 10, *et seq.*; Rushworth, ii. 3, 425; Whitlocke, 51.

was sent to the Tower, but quitted it almost immediately. After some mutual explanations, this quarrel was hushed up. A majority of twenty-three ordered the remonstrance to be printed.¹ The execution, however, of the order was delayed, as it was first necessary to present it to the king, who was daily expected.

He arrived, confident and haughty (Nov. 25), notwithstanding the check he had received in Scotland, and what he had heard of the new acerbity of parliament. Everywhere on his way, particularly at York, he had been received with vociferous manifestations of affection and joy. In many places, his concessions to the Scots had delighted the people; his secret machinations were unknown, or not understood. Besides, in the country, as well as in parliament, the royalist party was getting together, and exhibiting its feelings. This was the case even in the city of London. The king's friends had carried the election of the new lord mayor, Richard Gourney, an active, courageous man, devoted to the king, who prepared a most brilliant reception for his sovereign. A multitude of citizens on horseback, armed, preceded by the banners of the various companies, went to meet him, and escorted him with acclamations to the palace of Whitehall. The king in return gave them a magnificent banquet, and conferred the honour of knighthood on the lord mayor and several of the aldermen;² and the day after his arrival, eager to show the commons that he thought his position a strong one, he withdrew the guard which, in his absence, the earl of Essex had appointed for their safety, (Nov. 26.)³

The aspect of affairs now changed; to the unanimous enthusiasm of the entire kingdom succeeded party struggles; to reform, revolution. The leaders saw this, and their conduct suddenly assumed a new character. The remonstrance was presented to the king, (Dec. 1;) he patiently listened while it was read; and then, addressing the committee, asked: "Does the house intend to publish this declaration?" "We can give no answer," was the reply. "Well, then," said the king, "I suppose you do not expect an answer to so long a petition now; I shall give you one with as much speed as the

¹ Clarendon, i. 400; Parl. Hist., ii. 937.

² Rushworth, i. 3, 429; May, *ut sup.*; Whitelocke, 50; Evelyn's Mem., Appendix ii. 70.

³ Parl. Hist. ii. 940.

weightiness of the business will permit."¹ The leaders of the commons were altogether indifferent on the point; without any delay whatever, they at once brought forward projects that even the remonstrance did not hint at. Hitherto they had redressed grievances, appealed to the ancient laws; now they proclaimed new principles, imperiously demanded innovations. A bill was under discussion for levying troops for Ireland; they inserted these words in the preamble, "That the king hath, in no case, or upon any occasion but invasion from a foreign power, authority to press the free-born subject, that being inconsistent with the freedom and liberty of his person."² Another bill was proposed, that the organization of the militia and the nomination of its officers, should for the future only take place with the concurrence and consent of parliament, (Dec. 7.)³ By the influence of the presbyterians, the bill excluding all ecclesiastics from civil offices (Oct. 23)⁴ had, a few days before the king's return, been again brought forward and adopted; but the lords kept it waiting; the commons now angrily complained of this: "This house," said they, "being the representative body of the whole kingdom, and their lordships being but as particular persons, and coming to parliament in a particular capacity, if they shall not be pleased to consent to the passing of these acts and others necessary to the preservation and safety of the kingdom, then this house, together with such of the lords that are more sensible of the safety of the kingdom, will join together, and represent the same unto his majesty." And the popular noblemen, the earls of Northumberland, Essex, and Warwick, permitted this language to pass unnoticed.⁵ Out of doors, the party rallied round their leaders with equal ardour; the remonstrance was published, (Sept. 14.)⁶ The city declared that, in receiving the king with so much pomp, the citizens of London had not meant to convey any change of sentiment towards their true friends, and that they would live and die with the parliament.⁷ A petition from the apprentices set forth, in lamentable array, the sufferings of commerce and trades, imputing them to the papists, the bishops, and bad

¹ Parl. Hist. ii. 942.

² Clarendon, i. 507; Parl. Hist., ii. 909; May, *ut sup.*

³ May, *ut sup.*; Clarendon, i. 513.

⁴ Parl. Hist. ii. 970.

⁵ Journals, Commons, Dec. 3.

⁶ Parl. Hist. ii. 970.

⁷ May.

councillors.¹ In the counties, associations were formed devoted to the defence of the people's liberty and rights. From all quarters, the nation hastened to the aid of the commons; sinister reports from time to time produced new proofs of their attachment; now it was rumoured that the life of Pym had been threatened; now, that the Irish rebels were preparing an invasion; a mysterious visit, a word picked up in the street, sufficed as groundwork for the party to base a plot upon, and to call upon their adherents for fresh oaths of union; and while the commons each day demanded the restoration of their guard, the multitude assembled each day round Westminster Hall formed one for them, incessantly sending forth shouts proclaiming a common peril.

Against these daring pretensions, maintained by such tumultuous passions, Charles, on his side, rallied all his partisans, the interested servants of absolute power, the loyal defenders of the king, whatever his cause, and those citizens who had until of late opposed tyranny, but who were brought back to the foot of the throne by the fear of innovations and excesses. The latter formed, almost solely, the rising royalist party in the house of commons. Lord Falkland, Mr. Hyde, and sir John Colepepper were its leaders; and Charles resolved to attach them to him. Already, before his journey into Scotland, he had held secret interviews with Hyde; and by the respectful wisdom of his advice, by his aversion to all innovations, above all, by his devotion to the church, Hyde had gained his confidence.² He did not equally like lord Falkland, who despised the court, cared little for the king, whom he had not come near, and opposed the innovators, rather for the sake of offended justice than for that of menaced power. Charles feared him, and did not feel at ease in his presence. However, it was necessary to conciliate him. Hyde, his most intimate friend, undertook the negotiation. Falkland at first refused; his scrupulous virtue severed him from the abettors of revolution; but his principles, his wishes, the impulses of his somewhat visionary imagination, constantly impelled him towards the friends of liberty. He alleged his antipathy to the court, his inability to

Clarendon; i. 519; Rushworth, i. 3. 403.

² Clarendon, Memoirs, i. *passim*.

serve it, and his resolution of never employing either falsehood, or corruption, or spies; "useful, perhaps necessary means," said he. "but with which I will never sully my hands." Surprised and piqued at having to solicit a subject, Charles nevertheless persisted. Hyde enlarged upon the immense injury such a refusal would be to the king. Falkland suffered himself to be persuaded, though disheartened beforehand, as the victim of a devotion prompted neither by affection nor hope. He was named secretary of state. Colepepper, much less influential, but distinguished for his boldness, and the resources of his mind in debate, became chancellor of the exchequer. Hyde alone, contrary to the king's wish, pertinaciously refused any office, not from fear, but from prudence, and from the opinion that he should serve him better in maintaining the exterior independence of his position. The three friends undertook the management of the king's affairs in the house, and Charles promised to attempt nothing there without their counsel.¹

At the same time, other servants, less useful, but more ardent, hastened from all parts of the kingdom to defend his honour and his life, threatened, as they said, by parliament. Notwithstanding the decay of the feudal system, the sentiments to which it had given rise still animated many of the gentry, inactive in their country seats, little accustomed to reflection or debate, they despised those prating, cavilling citizens, whose gloomy creed proscribed the wine-drinking, the sports, the pleasures of old England, and who assumed to rule the king, whom their fathers had not even had the honour to serve. Proud in the recollection of their own independence, the country gentry cared little about the new wants of public liberty. In common with the people, they had murmured against the court and against tyranny; but after so many concessions from the throne, their want of foresight and their loyalty made them indignant at the insolent pertinacity of the innovators. They came to London in arms, paraded the streets haughtily, showed themselves and expressed their opinions loudly in the taverns and public places, and often went to Whitehall to offer their services and solicit some favour from the king. There they were joined by others, drawn together

by a devotion less genuine, but still more blind, the officers, the *reformadoes*, whom the disbanding of the army had left without pay or employment; most of them soldiers of fortune, bred in the wars of the continent, dissolute, venal, and daring, irritated against the parliament, who had deprived them of their trade, against the people, who detested their manners, and ready to do anything for any master who would employ them, no matter in what cause. Young lawyers, students in the Temple, protégés of the court, or anxious to share its pleasures, or thinking they proved their high birth and elegance of taste by embracing its cause, swelled the restless and presumptuous throng which daily assembled round Whitehall, inveighing against the commons, insulting all who took part with them, prodigal of boastings and railleries, and eager for the king, or chance, to give them some opportunity of pushing their fortune by proving their loyalty.¹

The popular party were no less impatient to give them this opportunity; its assemblages became every day more numerous and excited. Bands of apprentices, workmen, women, went every morning from the city to Westminster, and in passing by Whitehall, the shouts, "No bishops! no popish lords!" were sent forth with redoubled energy. At times, they would halt, and one of them getting on a post, would there read to the crowd the names of the "disaffected members of the house of commons," or those of "the false, evil, rotten-hearted lords." Their audacity went so far as to demand that there should be no sentinel at the gates of the palace, so that they might see the king at any hour, whenever they pleased.² Violent contests soon arose; the names of cavaliers and roundheads distinguished the two parties; the citizens at first repelled the latter appellation as an insult, but afterwards adopted it as an honourable title.³ The cavaliers sought their enemies around Westminster Hall, at once to beard them, and to protect the menaced royalists as they left the houses of parliament. It was particularly against the upper house that the people's anger was directed, for the bill excluding the bishops still remained in suspense there. The archbishop of York, Williams, on his way to the house

¹ Ludlow's Memoirs, (1771,) 10.

² Clarendon, i. 526; May, *ut sup.*; Parl. Hist., ii. 986

³ Clarendon, i. 528, ii. 206; Rushworth, i. 3, 493.

on foot, tried to arrest with his own hands a young man who followed him with insults; the crowd rushed upon the prelate, and his friends had great difficulty in getting him off.¹ Both parties by turns made and rescued prisoners. Blood flowed, the cavaliers boasted with derision of having dispersed their adversaries, but the latter returned the next day, more experienced and better armed. One evening, when the lords were still sitting, the tumult without became so violent, that the marquis of Hertford went over to the bishops' bench, and advised them not to go out; "for," said he, "those people vow they will watch you at your coming out, and search every coach for you with torches, so as you cannot escape." "Must we then pass the night here?" asked the bishops. "It is very possible," replied, with a smile, some of the supporters of the bill of exclusion. They did depart, however; some in the carriage of one of the popular lords, others by back passages; and even among their friends many began to think their presence was not worth the danger it occasioned.² Twice did the upper house claim the assistance of the commons in the suppression of these outrages, (Dec 20—30); but the commons remained silent, or answered by complaining of the disorders of the cavaliers. "We must not discourage our friends, this being a time we must make use of all of them," said the leaders. "God forbid the house of commons should proceed in any way to dishearten the people to obtain their just rights in such a way!"³ The lords applied to the magistrates, calling upon them to proceed against the rioters according to law; and upon an order, to which was affixed the great seal, the justices enjoined the constables to place a guard round Westminster Hall to disperse the mob. The commons had the constables to their bar, treated the order as a breach of privilege, and sent one of the justices to the Tower.⁴ At the same time, the house voted that as the king persisted in refusing them a guard, each member might bring one servant with him, and station him at the door of the house, armed as he might think fit.

These riots, these incessant outcries, this constant, unmanageable disorder, filled the king with anger and with fear;

¹ Clarendon, Hist., i. 526, ii. 291; Rushworth, i. 3, 403.

² Parl. Hist., ii. 901.

³ Ib. 980.

⁴ Ib. 987.

never, amid his darkest apprehensions, had such scenes entered his imagination; he was astonished and indignant that royal majesty should have to endure such gross insults; and it was no longer for his power alone, but for the safety, at all events, for the dignity of his person and life, that he began to be alarmed. The queen, still more agitated, besieged him with her terrors; and the pride of the monarch and the tenderness of the husband could not support the idea of peril or insult to the object of his affections, the partner of his rank. Looking around in every direction for some support against the multitude, some means of preventing or punishing their excesses, he resolved to get rid of the governor of the Tower, sir William Balfour, a person devoted to the commons, and to put a sure and daring man in his place. Three thousand pounds, the produce of the sale of some of the queen's jewels, were given to sir William to appease his anger. Sir Thomas Lunsford, one of the most audacious leaders of the cavaliers assembled at Whitehall, succeeded him. (towards Dec. 20.)¹ At the same time, the king assumed a higher tone with the parliament, endeavouring to intimidate it in his turn. Hyde had prepared a firm and able answer to the remonstrance; Charles adopted it, and had it published in his own name.² The bill for the impressment of soldiers was still under discussion in parliament; before it was presented to him, Charles went to the house, and declared that he would not accept it until the passage in the preamble, depriving him of the power of ordering impressment, was struck out, (Dec. 14.)³ Irish affairs made no progress; he called upon the commons to take them decidedly in hand, and offered to raise ten thousand volunteers if the house would promise to pay them, (Dec. 29.)⁴ On their part, and perhaps with his consent, the bishops assembled to deliberate on their situation; violence awaited them at the doors of the upper house; they resolved to absent themselves, to set forth in a protest the motives of their withdrawal, declaring null and void every bill that should be adopted without the concurrence of all the legitimate and necessary members of parliament. Suddenly drawn up and

¹ Clarendon, i. 517; ii. 284.

² Clarendon's Memoirs, i. 124; Parl. Hist. ii. 970.

³ Parl. Hist. ii. 988

⁴ Ib. ii. 901.

signed by twelve bishops,¹ the protest was at once presented to the king, who eagerly received it: it presented to him the hope of one day, under this pretext, annulling the acts of that fatal parliament which he could not quell; on the instant, without mentioning the matter to his new councillors, whose advice he feared much more than he estimated their influence, he ordered the lord high keeper to carry it that same day to the upper house, applauding himself for his address, (Dec. 30.)²

The astonishment of the lords was extreme; they could not conceive how twelve bishops, whose parliamentary existence was at that moment in question, should thus pretend to order the fate of parliament itself, to annihilate it by their absence. Communicated without delay to the commons, the protest was received there with that apparent anger and secret joy which the faults of an enemy inspire. The impeachment of the bishops for conspiring against the fundamental laws of the kingdom and the existence of parliament³ was at once moved and carried. Irritated by their imprudence, perhaps glad to avail themselves of a pretext for forsaking without shame a ruined cause, their friends remained silent; only one voice rose in their favour, saying, they were stark mad, and should be sent to Bedlam, and not before the judges.⁴ The upper house sanctioned the impeachment, and sent the prelates to the Tower. Eager to make the most of so favourable an opportunity, the leaders of the commons pressed on all their attacks. They had already complained of the king's declaration on the subject of the Impressment Bill, as destructive of their privileges, which did not permit that he should take notice of any measure while under discussion; they now insisted on the necessity of firmly securing these privileges, their only anchor of safety amidst so many perils. They protested against handing over the Tower to sir Thomas Lunsford, a man in almost universal disrepute, without fortune, religion, or morals, known only by his acts of violence against the people, and capable of the most desperate excesses. Already,

¹ The archbishop of York, and the bishops of Durham, Lichfield, St. Asaph, Oxford, Bath and Wells, Hereford, Ely, Gloucester, Peterborough, Llandaff, and Norwich.

² Parl. Hist. ii. 993; Clarendon, i. 546.

³ Parl. Hist. ii. 994; Whitelocke, 53.

⁴ Clarendon, i. 552.

said they, the alarm was so great in the city that merchants and foreigners no longer deposited their bullion in the Tower. They demanded the nomination of another governor. Lord Digby, now become the king's most intimate confidant, was denounced for having said that parliament was not free.¹ Finally, reports were even spread that the queen herself might ere long be impeached for high treason.

The king seemed to give way; he took no step in favour of the bishops, withdrew the government of the Tower from Lunsford, and gave it to Sir John Byron, a grave and steady man, generally esteemed,² spoke no more about the riots, did not complain of the last debates. Yet secret reports and vague whispers disturbed the commons. The queen, silent and reserved, seemed animated with some hope; lord Digby, whose presumptuous temerity was well known, visited her frequently, and seemed every day more and more intimate with her and with the king. The concourse of cavaliers at Whitehall doubled. Without explaining their fears, the commons sent a message, applying once more for a guard, (Dec. 31.) The king made no answer to the application, which, he said, must be communicated to him in a written petition. Thereupon, the commons ordered arms to be brought into the house, as if assured of some immediate danger. Three days after, the king's answer came; it was a refusal, concluding with these words. "We do engage unto you solemnly, on the word of a king, that the security of all and every one of you from violence, is and shall ever be as much our care as the preservation of us and our children." But the house, more alarmed than ever, ordered the lord mayor, the sheriffs, and common council, to keep the London militia on foot, and to place strong guards at various points of the city.³

On that very day, (Jan. 3, 1642,) sir Edward Herbert, the attorney-general, went to the house of peers, and, in the king's name, accused of high treason lord Kimbolton and five members of the commons, Hampden, Pym, Holles, Strode, and Haslerig, for having attempted, 1st, to subvert the fundamental laws of the kingdom, and to deprive the king of his lawful authority; 2ndly, to alienate the people from the king

¹ Parl. Hist. ii. 960.

² Clarendon, i. 518.

³ Parl. Hist. ii. 1002; Rushworth, i. 3, 471; Journals, Commons.

by odious calumnies; 3rdly, to raise the army against the king; 4thly, to engage a foreign power, Scotland, to invade the kingdom; 5thly, to annihilate the rights and the very existence of parliaments; 6thly, to excite against the king and the parliament seditious assemblages, for the purpose of securing, by violence, success to their criminal designs; 7thly, to levy war upon the king. Sir Edward required, at the same time, that a committee should be appointed to examine the charges, and that the house would be pleased to secure the persons of the accused.¹

The lords were thunderstruck; no one had foreseen such a proceeding, and no one dared to speak first. Lord Kimbolton rose: "I am ready," said he, "to obey any order of the house; but since my impeachment is public, I demand that my justification may be so too." And he resumed his place amid continued silence. Lord Digby was sitting next him. He whispered in his ear, "What mischievous counsels are given to the king! It shall go hard but I find out whence they come." And he forthwith quitted the house, as if to seek the information of which he spoke. Yet it was he and no other, it is said, who had urged the king to this enterprise, undertaking, moreover, that he himself would demand the immediate arrest of lord Kimbolton, as soon as the attorney-general should have accused him.²

On the instant, a message from the lords informed the commons of what had passed; they had just heard that the king's people had gone to the houses of the five members, and were putting their seals on everything in them. The house forthwith voted these proceedings a breach of privilege, which the accused were entitled, and the constables were called upon in duty, to resist, and that the king's officers should be arrested and brought to the bar as delinquents. Sir John Hotham was sent to the lords to request an immediate conference, and with orders to declare that if the house of peers refused to combine with the commons in demanding a guard from the king, the commons would retire to a safer place. While they were waiting the lords' answer, a sergeant-at-arms presented himself. "In the name of the king my master," said he, "I am come to require Mr. Speaker to place in my custody

¹ Rushworth, i. 3, 473.

² Ib 474; Clarendon, i. 550.

five gentlemen, members of this house, whom his majesty has commanded me to arrest for high treason;" and he proceeded to name them. The accused were present, but not one quitted his place; the speaker ordered the sergeant to retire. Without tumult as without opposition, the house appointed a committee to go, the house still sitting, to inform the king that so important a message could only be answered after mature consideration. Two ministers of the crown, lord Falkland and sir John Colepepper, formed part of the committee: they had been quite ignorant of the plan. The conference with the lords was opened, and in less than an hour it was jointly resolved to order the removal of the seals placed on the papers of the five members, and that a guard should be demanded. The petition for a guard was forthwith conveyed to the king by the duke of Richmond, one of his most honest favourites. "I will give an answer to-morrow," said the king, in his turn; and the commons adjourned to the next day at one o'clock, ordering the accused to be in attendance at Westminster as usual.¹

When the house reassembled (Jan. 4) at the appointed hour, their uneasiness and anger were redoubled; the presentiment of some fresh danger, unknown but certain, agitated every mind. The royalists sat sorrowful and silent; among their adversaries a thousand reports were in active circulation, collected the evening before, during the night, that very morning: the cavaliers, it was said, had assembled, the king had sent them word to be ready, two barrels of gunpowder and arms had been brought from the Tower to Whitehall,² every one crowded round the five members, with conjectures, information, advice. They themselves knew more of the matter than their informants: the minister of France, long since in secret correspondence with them, and the countess of Carlisle, Pym's mistress, it is said, had given them notice of the coup d'état in preparation;³ but they mentioned not a word of this. Suddenly entered the house an officer, captain Langrish, lately returned from service in France, and whose connexion with some of the cashiered officers gave him opportunities of knowing all that was going on. He announced that the king was at hand, that he had seen him set out from White-

¹ Rushworth, i. 3, 474; Parl. Hist. ii. 1007. ² Rushworth, i. 3, 470

³ Ib. 477; Whitelocke, 53; Warwick's Mem. 203; Mazure, *Hist. de la Revolution*, iii. 429; Mad. de Motteville's Mem. (1750) i. 266.

hall, escorted by three or four hundred men, guards, cavaliers, students, all armed, to arrest the accused in person. A great tumult arose, but the necessity of a prompt decision soon appeased it. The house urged the five members to withdraw, as several gentlemen had already drawn their swords for resistance. Pym, Hampden, Holles, and Haslerig, at once departed; Strode refused; he was entreated, pressed; the king had already entered Palace Yard; at last his friend, sir Walter Earl, roughly pushed him out. The other members all took their seats. The king had traversed Westminster Hall between a double rank of his attendants; but only his body-guard ascended with him the stairs leading to the house; on reaching the door, he forbade them, under penalty of death, to follow him a step further, and entered the house uncovered, accompanied only by his nephew, the count palatine. All the members uncovered and rose. The king, as he passed, cast a glance at the place where Pym usually sat; not seeing him there, he advanced towards the speaker. "By your favour, Mr. Speaker," said he, "I will borrow your chair for a moment." Then seating himself, he cast his eyes round on the assembly: "Gentlemen," said he, "I am sorry for this occasion of coming unto you. Yesterday, I sent a serjeant-at-arms upon a very important occasion, to apprehend some that by my command were accused of high treason, whereunto I did expect obedience, and not a message; and I must declare unto you here, that albeit no king that ever was in England shall be more careful of your privileges, to maintain them to the uttermost of his power, than I shall be, yet you must know that in cases of treason no person hath a privilege; and therefore I am come to know if any of these persons that were accused are here, for I must tell you, gentlemen, that so long as these persons that I have accused, for no slight crime, but for treason, are here, I cannot expect that this house will be in the right way that I do heartily wish it; therefore I am come to tell you that I must have them wheresoever I find them. Mr. Speaker, where are they?" The speaker, falling on his knees, replied, "May it please your majesty, I have neither eyes to see nor tongue to speak, in this place, but as the house is pleased to direct me, whose servant I am here. And humbly beg your majesty's pardon, that I cannot give any other answer than this to what your majesty is pleased to demand of

me." "Well," replied the king, "since I see all the birds are flown, I do expect from you that you shall send them unto me as soon as they return hither. But I assure you, on the word of a king, I never did intend any force, but shall proceed against them in a legal and fair way; for I never meant any other: and now, since I see I cannot do what I came for, I will trouble you no more, but tell you, I do expect, as soon as they come to the house, you will send them to me, otherwise I must take my own course to find them." He then quitted the chair, his hat still in his hand. The house remained motionless; but from several parts of the house, as the king withdrew, arose the cry, "Privilege! Privilege!"¹

As soon as he was gone, the house, without doing, or even announcing anything, adjourned to the next day; all the members went away, eager to learn to what extent the king's designs had gone, and what the public thought of them. They found outside, on the stairs, in the great hall, at the doors, among their own servants who were waiting for them, and in the assembled multitude, an emotion no less vivid than their own. "Nothing," says an affidavit of the day, "was talked of but the insults of the cavaliers. one of them, a captain Hyde, drew a pistol from his pocket, and said, jeeringly, it was not charged, but upon trial it was found to be charged very deep, and he said he had five supplies for the same; and he cursed and swore at the parliament for prick-eared, cropt-eared rascals, and said he'd kill as many of 'em as he could."² The five members had retired into the city; the citizens took to arms; the lord mayor attempted in vain to calm them; strong patrols were spontaneously formed for the common safety; and during the whole of the evening, bands of apprentices paraded the streets, crying out from door to door that the cavaliers were coming to set the city on fire; some even added that the king was commanding them in person.

The agitation was equally great at Whitehall. The king and queen had built the highest hopes on this coup d'état; it had for a long time past occupied all their thoughts, had been the constant subject of their private conversation, of their con-

¹ Rushworth, i. 3, 477; Parl. Hist. ii. 1010; Journals, Commons; Whitelocke, 52.

² Rushworth, i. 3, 482; Ludlow's Mem. 17.

ferences with their most intimate confidants. In the morning, Charles, kissing his wife before he went away, promised her that in an hour he would return, master, at length, of his kingdom, and the queen, watch in hand, had counted the minutes till his return.¹ Now, all had failed; and though the king still persisted in his design, it was without hoping anything from it, without knowing how to accomplish it. Offended, and full of affliction, his wisest friends, Falkland, Hyde, Colepepper, kept aloof, and proffered no counsel. A proclamation was issued ordering the gates to be closed, and that no citizen should give refuge to the accused; but no one, even at court, deceived himself as to the inefficacy of these orders; the very house in which were the five members was perfectly well known;² it was not thought any one would make his way thither after them. Lord Digby alone was desirous to expiate by his temerity the imprudence of his advice and his backwardness in the house of peers at the moment of the impeachment. He offered the king to go in person, with Lunsford and a few cavaliers, to take the members from their retreat, and bring them to him dead or alive. But Charles, either from some remains of respect for the laws, or from the timidity which alternated in his mind with reckless daring, refused this proposal, and resolved to go himself the next day into the city, and solemnly call upon the common council to deliver up the accused, hoping that by his presence and gracious words he should soften those whose anger he had so little foreseen.

Accordingly, at about ten o'clock, on the 5th Jan., he left Whitehall without any guards and manifesting an entire confidence in the affection of his subjects. The multitude crowded on his way, but cold and silent, or only lifting up their voices to conjure him to live in concord with his parliament.³ In some places, threatening cries were heard; the words, 'Privilege of parliament! privilege of parliament!' echoed around him, and a man, named Walker, threw into his carriage a pamphlet, entitled *To your tents, O Israel!* the watchword of revolt of the ten tribes of Jerusalem, when they separated from Rehoboam.⁴ On arriving at Guildhall, Charles claimed

¹ Madame de Motteville's Mem. i. 265

² Whitelocks, p. 53.

³ In Coleman-street.

⁴ Rushworth, i. 3, 479.

the surrender of the five members, affable and mild in his speech, protesting his devotion to the reformed religion, the sincerity of his concessions, and promising to act in all things according to the laws. No plaudits answered him; like the people, the common council were grave and sorrowful. The king addressing one of the sheriffs, said to be an ardent presbyterian, told him he would dine with him. The sheriff bowed, and when the hall rose, received him in his house with splendour and respect. On his return to Whitehall, Charles only obtained from the crowd the same reception as before, and re-entered his palace, angry and depressed.¹

The commons had meantime assembled (Jan. 5); had voted that after so enormous a breach of their privileges, until reparation had been made, and a trusty guard protected them from similar perils, they could not sit with any sense of freedom, and had accordingly adjourned for six days. But, though they adjourned, they did not cease to act. A committee, vested with great powers,² was ordered to establish itself in the city, to make an inquiry into the late outrage, and to examine into the general state of the kingdom, especially of Ireland, in concert with the citizens, the faithful friends of parliament. The committee was installed at Guildhall with great pomp (Jan. 6); a strong guard was in attendance, and a deputation from the common council went to meet it, and place at its disposal all the force, all the services of the city.³ Its sittings were as full of bustle as those of the house, every member of which had a right to be present; the place whither the five members had retired was close by, and nothing was done without their knowledge and advice.⁴ They even went several times in person to the committee, and the citizens loudly cheered them as they passed, proud to have them among them, to be the protectors of their representatives. In the midst of this triumph of the commons, their leaders skilfully managed to augment their zeal, by keeping up their fears. Every hour, the commons and the city contracted a closer alliance and mutually emboldened each other.⁵ At last, of

¹ Clarendon, i. 561; Rushworth, i. 3, 479.

² It was composed of twenty-five members; two of the king's ministers, Falkland and Colepepper were upon it; Rushworth, *ut. sup.* 479.

³ Clarendon, i. 563. ⁴ *Ib.*; Whitlocke, 54. ⁵ Rushworth, i. 3, 482.

its own sole authority, it is said, and as if it had been the house itself, the committee published a declaration containing the result of its inquiry;¹ and the common council addressed a petition to the king, complaining of bad councillors, of the cavaliers, of the papists, of the new governor of the Tower, adopting in a high tone the cause of the five members, and demanding all the reforms which the commons had merely touched upon.² (Jan. 7, 1642.)

The king was alone, shut up in Whitehall, disclaimed by his more honest partisans. Even the cavaliers, now intimidated, had dispersed, or kept silence. The king attempted an answer to the petition of the common council, and once more ordered the arrest of the accused.³ (Jan. 8.) But his answers were without influence, his orders without effect. He learned that, in two days, the house would resume its sittings, and that the five members were to be brought back to Westminster in triumph, by the militia, the people, and even the watermen of the Thames, of whose entire affection he had till then thought himself certain. "What," said he, angrily, "do these water-rats, too, forsake me!" and this speech, soon repeated among the men, was received by them as an insult calling for revenge.⁴ Abandoned, humiliated, deserted, irritated at the general cry which daily assailed him without one voice on his side to oppose it, Charles could not endure the idea of seeing his enemies pass triumphant before his palace. The queen, alternately furious with anger and trembling with fear, conjured him to depart; the royalists and messengers, who had been sent to different parts of the kingdom, promised him strength and safety elsewhere; the cavaliers, defeated in London, boasted of their influence in their counties; away from the parliament, said they, the king would be free; without the king, what could the parliament do? The resolution was taken. it was agreed to retire first to Hampton Court, and afterwards further if it should be found necessary; secret orders were sent to the governors of several places, whose devotion seemed sure; the earl of Newcastle set out for the north, where his influence prevailed, and

¹ Clarendon, i. 567, &c.

² Rushworth, i. 3, 480,

³ *Ib.*

⁴ Lilly, *Observ. on the Life and Death of king Charles*. Mazères, *Tracts* (1815).

on the 10th of January, the evening before the return of the commons, Charles, accompanied only by his wife, his children, and some attendants, quitted London and the palace of Whitehall, which he was destined never to re-enter, but on his way to the scaffold.¹

The day after his departure, at about two in the afternoon, the Thames was covered with armed vessels, escorting the five members back to Westminster; a multitude of boats followed, adorned with flags, and filled with citizens; along each bank of the river marched the London militia, bearing the last declarations of parliament at the end of their pikes;² an officer formed in the army of Gustavus Adolphus, captain Skippon, had the day before been appointed to command them. He was a rough, illiterate man, but daring, of austere morals, and very popular in the city. An innumerable crowd closely followed this procession; as they passed Whitehall they stopped, shouting, 'Where now are the king and his cavaliers? what has become of them?'³ On their arrival at Westminster Hall, the five members hastened to eulogize the devotion of the city in the public cause, and the sheriffs, introduced into the house, received the thanks of the speaker. As they departed, another procession filed up; four thousand knights, gentlemen, freeholders, &c., arrived on horseback from Buckinghamshire, Hampden's native county, with a petition to the house against papist lords, bad councillors, and in favour of their worthy representative; they had also a petition for the upper house, and a third for the king, and all carried on their hats a printed oath to live and die with the parliament, whoever might be its enemies.⁴ On all sides burst forth that proud and joyful enthusiasm which permits, which calls for, on the part of the leaders of the people, the boldest resolutions: the commons gave way to it with judicious energy, as the pilot to the violent but propitious wind. In a few hours they had voted that no member, under any pretext, could be arrested without their consent; a bill was adopted giving to both houses the right of adjourning, in case of need, to any place they might think fit; an address was drawn up

¹ Clarendon, i. 590; Rushworth, i. 3, 564; Journals, Commons, Jan. 11, 1642, *et seq.*; Whitelocke, 54.

² May, ii. 41; Rushworth, i. 3, 484

³ Clarendon, i. 591.

⁴ *Ib.*, *ut sup.*; Rushworth, i. 3, 486

to the king, that it would please him to withdraw from sir John Byron the government of the Tower; and until his answer should be received, Skippon was ordered to place guards around that fortress, and narrowly to watch its approaches. Letters were despatched to Goring, governor of Portsmouth, forbidding him to receive into that town either troops or ammunition without the authority of parliament; sir John Hotham, a rich and influential gentleman of Yorkshire, was ordered to proceed immediately, and take the command of Hull, an important place, the key to the North of England, and which contained large arsenals. On the third day (Jan. 13), the house voted that the menaced kingdom should without delay be put in a state of defence; the lords refused to sanction this declaration; but this was of little consequence: the commons had effected their object, by passing the resolution, and conveying their wishes to the people.¹

The commons were not mistaken in anticipating war; the king's only thought now was to prepare for it. In London, he was powerless and humiliated; but no sooner had he left it than he was surrounded only by his partisans, and no longer receiving every day, every hour, proofs of his weakness, he freely gave himself up to the hope of conquering, with an armed force the enemy from whom he had just fled without a struggle. The cavaliers, too, had reassumed all their presumption; already they seemed to look upon the war as declared, and were eager to strike the first blow. The day after the king's departure, the house learned that two hundred of them, commanded by Lunsford, had marched towards Kingston, twelve miles from London, where the military stores of the county of Surrey were deposited, as if to take possession of it and to establish themselves there; it was also known that lord Digby had gone to meet them on the part of the king, to thank them for their zeal, and to concert some hostile plan with them. The parliament at once took its measures, and these attempts were defeated: lord Digby, energetically denounced, fled beyond sea.² Thinking himself still too near London, the king left Hampton Court for Windsor, (Jan. 12, 1642;) Lunsford and his cavaliers fol-

¹ Parl. Hist. ii. 1028; Rushworth, i. 3, 469.

² Rushworth, *ut sup.*; Nelson, ii. 845; Parl. Hist., ii. 1036; Whitelocke, 54.

lowed him. Here, in a secret council, it was resolved that the queen, taking the crown jewels with her, should proceed to Holland, purchase ammunition and arms, and solicit the aid of the continental monarchs; the pretext to be given for this journey was the necessity of taking over to the prince of Orange the princess Mary, yet a mere girl, whom he had married six months before.¹ On his part, the king, still keeping up his negotiations with parliament, was to retire by degrees to the northern counties, where his partisans were most numerous, to fix his residence at York, and await there the opportunity and the means of acting. Everything thus settled, the queen with great secrecy made preparations for her journey; and the king invited parliament to draw up a complete statement of its grievances, and thus present them to him all at once, promising to do right to them without the delay of a single day, and thus put an end to their contentions, (Jan. 20.)²

The house of lords received this message with joy; the king had numerous friends there; many others, alarmed or wearied out, only desired to terminate the struggle so as to leave no anxieties about the future. But the commons, more clear-sighted and more resolute, could not believe either that the king would grant them all they required, or that, if he promised it, he would keep his word. His proposal was, in their eyes, merely a stratagem to get rid of them at a blow, and, dismissing them, to resume his arbitrary power. They refused to concur in the eager thanks of the lords, unless at the same time the king was distinctly called upon to transfer the command of the Tower, of the royal fortresses, and of the militia, to men who possessed the confidence of parliament.³ The peers rejected the amendment, but thirty-two protested against its rejection;⁴ and the commons, strengthened by the support of such a minority, forwarded the petition to the king in their own name. His answer was a decided refusal (Jan. 28)⁵ as to the government of the Tower and fortresses, and vague and evasive objections as to the militia. His sole purpose evidently was to yield nothing more, and meanwhile to gain time. The commons, on their

¹ Clarendon, i. 653; Orleans, *Histoire des Révolutions d'Angleterre* (1804), book ix.

² Parl. Hist. ii. 1045, *et seq.*

³ Parl. Hist. ii. 1048.

⁴ Ib. 1040.

⁵ Rushworth, i. 3, 517.

part, did not wish to lose time: well served at Windsor, as well as at London—for everywhere the opinion of their strength was great—they had spies and friends, and were perfectly acquainted with all the king's projects, with the meaning of the queen's journey, and with the intrigues of the court in the north of the kingdom and on the continent. The danger was pressing; it might so happen that the king would be ready for war before the question of the militia was decided, and then, how resist him? Fears more illusory, but nearer at hand, agitated the people; they talked of ammunition removed from the Tower, of plots against the lives of the popular leaders; they were irritated at conquering thus repeatedly to no purpose. A fresh and energetic outburst of public feeling, it was thought, would alone suffice to surmount the new obstacles which had presented themselves, to impel the zealous to action, excite the lukewarm, and intimidate their opponents. Petitions flowed in from all parts; from all the counties, from every class of citizens; apprentices, little shopkeepers, poor workmen, London porters; even women crowded round Westminster Hall with petitions. When these last appeared, Skippon, who commanded the guard, was astonished: "Let us be heard," they cried, "for one woman that's here to-day, there will be five hundred to-morrow." Skippon went to the house of commons for orders, and, on his return, gently persuaded them to retire. But they came again two days after; having chosen Ann Stagg, the wife of a wealthy brewer, for their speaker, and bearing a petition, at the end of which they had carefully explained their motives: "It may be thought strange and unbecoming our sex," said they; "to show ourselves here, bearing a petition to this honourable assembly; but Christ purchased us at as dear a rate as he did men, and therefore requireth the same obedience for the same mercy as of men. We are sharers in the public calamities. We do this, not out of self-conceit or pride of heart, as seeking to equal ourselves with men, either in authority or wisdom; but, according to our places, to discharge that duty we owe to God and the cause of his church. The petition was received; Pym went out to acknowledge it. He said: "Good women, your petition, with the reasons hath been read in the house, and is thankfully accepted of, and is come in a seasonable time.

Repair to your houses, we intreat, and turn your petitions into prayers at home for us. We have been, are, and shall be, ready to relieve you, your husbands, and children." They retired in silence—a remarkable instance of reserve amidst the wild excitement of popular enthusiasm, of moral sobriety amidst the machinations of party.¹

The petitions were all exactly to the same effect; they all demanded the reform of the church, the chastisement of the papists, the repression of the malignants. Some went more into detail, and in these the house of peers was openly threatened: "Let those noble worthies of the peers," said they to the commons, "who concur with your happy votes, be earnestly requested to join with your honourable house, and to sit and vote as one entire body; which, we hope, will remove our destructive fears, and removed, prevent that which apprehension will make the wisest and peaceablest men to put into execution." "We never doubted the commons," cried the people at the gates of Westminster, "but everything sticks in the lords; let us have the names of those who hinder the agreement between the good lords and the commons."² Even in the house of lords, the language of the two parties began to be that of war. "Whoever refuses to agree with the commons as to the militia is an enemy to the state," said the earl of Northumberland. He was called upon to explain: "We all think the same!" cried his friends, then in the minority on this question. The multitude were at the door; fear seized the lords; several went out, others changed their opinion. The lord chancellor, Littleton, himself, with some insignificant reservations, voted with the commons, and the bill, at last, received the sanction of the house, as did, a few days afterwards (Feb. 5), the bill for the exclusion of the bishops, which had been three months in suspense.³

This last was presented to the king by itself (Feb. 7), the ordinance respecting the militia not being yet drawn up; his perplexity was great: he had just informed the parliament of the queen's approaching journey: he had, to soften them, officially given up all proceedings against the five members⁴ (Feb. 2),

¹ Almost all these petitions were presented between Jan. 20 and Feb. 5, 1642; that of the women, among others, on Feb. 4; Journals, Commons, Parl. Hist. ii. 1040, *et seq.*

² Clarendon, i. 645; iii. 74.

³ Ib. i. 648; Parl. Hist. ii. 1099, 1367

⁴ Rushworth, i. 3, 492.

he had even consented to appoint, as governor of the Tower, Sir John Conyers, whom the commons had named¹ (Feb. 11); but his hope in all this had been to elude any great question, till the time he should be in a position to refuse doing anything at all. The exclusion of the bishops troubled his conscience: to give up the militia was to place at the disposition of his enemies the whole available force of the country. Yet he was pressed hard; his own councillors thought he could not refuse; lord Falkland, still supposing him sincere, constantly advocated concession; Colepepper, not particularly devout, and inclined to expedients, strongly urged the adoption of the bill as to the bishops, saying that the militia were far more important, for that everything might be regained by the sword, and that then it would be easy to declare void a consent exacted by violence. "Is this the advice of Hyde?" inquired the king; "No, sire; I must own I think neither the one bill nor the other ought to be sanctioned." "You are quite right, and I shall act upon your opinion." Colepepper went to the queen, pointed out to her the danger which the king, which she herself was exposed to, the obstacles which would be thrown in the way of her journey, now the only means of placing the king in a position to defeat his enemies. The vehement emphasis of his gesticulation and of his language, soon agitated and convinced the queen, as prompt to fear as to hope, and, moreover, not over friendly towards the Anglican bishops. She rushed to her husband's apartments, and, in a passion of tears, implored him to consult their own safety and that of their children. Charles could not resist her; he gave way with sorrow, and already repentant, as in Strafford's trial, authorized the commissioners to sign the bill in his name, said nothing about the militia, and immediately departed for Dover² (Feb. 16), where the queen was to embark.

He had scarcely arrived there, when a message from the commons followed him; like Colepepper, they cared much more about the militia than about the exclusion of the bishops, who were already defeated and in prison. They had hastened to draw up their ordinance; they had set forth in it the names of the lieutenants who were to command in each

¹ Parl. Hist. ii. 1087: Clarendon, i. 655.

² Clarendon, *Memoirs*, i. 116.

county, and solicited its immediate sanction. "I must take time to consider the matter," said the king; "I will give my answer on my return."¹ On his way back, after the queen had embarked,² he received at Canterbury (Feb. 25) another message, still more pressing than the first. He learned at the same time that the commons objected to the departure of his son Charles, prince of Wales, whom he had directed to proceed to Greenwich, intending to take him with him into the north; that they were prosecuting the attorney-general, Herbert, for having obeyed his orders in accusing the five members, and that they had intercepted and opened a letter from lord Digby to the queen. So much distrust, after so much concession, offended him as much as though his concessions had been sincere. He received the messengers angrily, but without giving any decisive answer.³ On arriving at Greenwich (Feb. 26), he found the prince, whom his tutor, the marquis of Hertford, notwithstanding the prohibition of the commons, on receiving the king's orders, had at once taken thither. At length easy as to his wife and children, he sent his answer to the parliament;⁴ he consented to entrust the militia to the commanders whom it had named, but on condition that he might dismiss them, if he saw fit, and that the principal towns in the kingdom should be excepted from the measure; in these the militia were to remain under the government of their charters and of the ancient laws; then, without awaiting its reply, he began, by short stages, his journey to York. At Theobalds, twelve commissioners from the parliament overtook him (March 1); on receiving his answer, it voted it to be a positive refusal; that, if he persisted in it, it would dispose of the militia without consulting him, and that his return to London could alone prevent the evils with which the kingdom was threatened. The tone of the message was rude and abrupt, as if parliament wished to show it knew its strength, and was not afraid to use it. "I am so much amazed at this message," said the king, "that I know not what to answer. You speak of jealousies and fears! lay your hands to your hearts and ask yourselves

¹ Parl. Hist. ii. 1083, *et seq.*

The queen embarked Feb. 23.

² Clarendon, *Memoirs*, *ut sup.*

⁴ Dated Feb. 26; Rushworth, i. 3, 521; Clarendon, *Memoirs*.

whether I may not likewise be disturbed with fears and jealousies? And if so, I assure you this message hath nothing lessened it. As to the militia, I thought so much of it before I sent that answer, and am so much assured that the answer is agreeable to what in justice or reason you can ask, or I in honour grant, that I shall not alter it in any point. For my residence near you, I wish it might be so safe and honourable, that I had no cause to absent myself from Whitehall: ask yourselves whether I have not. For my son, I shall take that care of him which shall justify me to God, as a father, and to my dominions as a king. To conclude, I assure you, upon my honour, that I have no thought but of peace and justice to my people, which I shall by all fair means seek to preserve and maintain, relying upon the goodness and providence of God, for the preservation of myself and rights;" and he continued his journey. A week after (March 9), at Newmarket, other commissioners presented themselves; they brought a declaration in which the parliament, recapitulating all its grievances, all its fears, justified its conduct, and once more conjured the king to return to London, to come to an understanding with his people, and thus dissipate the dark presentiments which agitated all minds. Deep feeling pervaded the firm language in which the message was couched; it equally manifested itself in the interview between the commissioners and the king: the conversation was long, urgent, earnest, as of men profoundly moved by the prospect of impending rupture, and who were still endeavouring to persuade each other to avert it; it was evident that though no longer hesitating as to their future course, though there were no means of reconciliation, though they felt the struggle to be inevitable and had made up their minds to go through with it, yet both parties felt pain in commencing it, and, though without hope, made yet a last effort against it. "What would you have?" said the king. "Have I violated your laws? have I denied to pass any one bill for the ease and security of my subjects? I do not ask you what you have done for me. Have any of my people been transported with fears and apprehensions? I have offered as free and general a pardon as yourselves can devise. God so deal with me and mine, as all my thoughts and intentions are upright for the maintenance of the true protestant profession, and for the observance and

preservation of the laws of this land; and I hope God will bless and assist those laws for my preservation."¹ "But the militia, sir?" said lord Holland. "The militia? I did not deny it." "But if your majesty would come near the parliament?" "I would you had given me cause, but I am sure this declaration is not the way to it. In all Aristotle's Rhetoric there is no such argument of persuasion." "The parliament," said lord Pembroke, "has humbly besought your majesty to come near it." "Your declaration hath taught me your words are not sufficient." "Will your majesty, then, deign to tell us what you would have?" "I would whip a boy in Westminster school that could not tell that by my answer; you are much mistaken, however, if you think my answer to that a denial." "Might not the militia be granted, as desired by parliament, for a time?" "No, by God! not for an hour; you have asked that of me in this which was never asked of a king, and with which I would not trust my wife and children." Then turning towards the commissioners of the commons, he said: "The business of Ireland will never be done in the way you are in; four hundred will never do that work; it must be put into the hands of one. If I were trusted with it, I would pawn my head to end that work; and though I am a beggar myself, yet, by God, I can find money for that."² These last words roused every suspicion; the commissioners saw in them the acknowledgment of hidden resources, the intention of throwing parliament into disrepute, of imputing to it the troubles of Ireland, and finally, the desire of being alone at the head of an army, to dispose of it at his pleasure. The conference proceeded no further; the commissioners returned to London, and the king, continuing his journey, arrived at York without any other incident.

And now commenced, between the parliament and him, a struggle hitherto without example in Europe, the clear and glorious symptom of the revolution which then took its be-

¹ Rushworth, i. 3, 523, 524; Clarendon, Memoirs, i. 129.

² This conversation is taken from a pamphlet published in London immediately after the return of the commissioners, (at W. Gay's, 1642,) and which contained an account of all that passed between them and the king. The printer of this pamphlet was sent for, and questioned by the peers; but on his replying that he had the MS. from the chancellor's secretary, the house dismissed him. Parl. Hist., ii. 1126; Rushworth, i. 3, 526.

ginning, and which was destined to have its accomplishment in our own times. The negotiations went on, but without either party hoping anything from them, or even proposing to treat. It was no longer each other they addressed in their declarations and messages; both appealed to the whole nation, to public opinion; to this new power both seemed to look for their strength and their success. The origin and extent of royal power, the privileges of both houses, the limits of the allegiance due from subjects, the militia, petitions, the distribution of offices, became the subjects of an official controversy, in which the general principles of social order, the different kinds of government, the primitive rights of liberty, the history, laws, and customs of England, were by turns set forth, explained, and commented upon. In the interval between the disputes of the two parties in parliament, and their physical struggle on the field of battle, reason and science were seen to create an interposition, so to speak, of several months, suspending the course of events and using their ablest endeavours to secure the free adhesion of the people, by stamping on one or the other cause the character of legitimacy. At the opening of parliament, England had neither desired nor even thought of a revolution; the dissenters merely meditated one in the church; the return to legal order, the re-establishment of ancient liberties, the reform of actual and pressing abuses, such had been, or at least so it thought, the sole wish and hope of the nation. The leaders themselves, bolder and more enlightened, scarcely formed any more extended projects; the energy of their will surpassed the ambition of their thoughts; and they had gone on from day to day without any ultimate aim, without system, carried forward simply by the progressive development of their situation, and to satisfy urgent necessities. When the moment arrived for drawing the sword, all were aghast: not that their hearts were timid, nor that civil war in the abstract had either in the eyes of the parliament or the people anything strange or criminal about it; on the contrary, they read it with pride in the great charter, in the history of their country; more than once they had braved their masters, had taken away and given the crown; and those times were so far back, that the misery overclouding them was forgotten, and the people only saw in them glorious examples of their energy and their power. But it had always been in the name of the laws, of clear and acknowledged

rights, that resistance had been declared; in achieving liberty, England had ever regarded herself as only defending her inheritance; and to these words alone, "law," "legal order," had attached that popular and spontaneous respect which rejects discussion, and sanctions the boldest designs. Now, however, the two parties reciprocally accused each other of illegality and innovation, and both with justice; for the one had violated the ancient rights of the kingdom, and would not abjure the maxims of tyranny; the other claimed, in the name of principles as yet altogether indefinite and confused, liberties and a power till then unknown. Both felt the necessity of throwing the mantle of the law over their pretensions and their acts; both undertook to justify themselves, not only according to reason, but according to law. With them, the whole nation rushed eagerly into the lists, agitated still more than their leaders with sentiments that seemed to contradict each other, yet all equally sincere. Scarcely freed from an oppression which the laws of their ancestors had condemned but not prevented, they ardently sought for more efficacious guarantees; but it was still to the very laws, whose inadequacy had been experienced, that their hope was attached. New opinions, new ideas were fermenting in their minds; to these they trusted with vivid, pure faith; they gave themselves up with all their might, in all confidence, to that enthusiasm which seeks the triumph of truth, at whatever price; and, at the same time, unassuming in their thoughts, tenderly faithful to old customs, full of respect for old institutions, they wished to believe, that, far from changing aught in them, they were only rendering them true homage, and restoring them to vigour. Hence a singular mixture of boldness and timidity, of sincerity and hypocrisy, in the publications of all sorts, official or otherwise, with which England was then inundated. The ardour of the national mind was unbounded, the movement universal, unprecedented, immoderate; at London, at York, in all the great towns of the kingdom, pamphlets, periodical and occasional journals, were multiplied and diffused in every quarter;¹ political, reli-

¹ The following are the titles of a few of these publications: *Mercurius Aulicus*—*Mercurius Britannicus*—*Rusticus*—*Pragmaticus*—*Politicus*—*Publicus*; *Diurnal Paper*—*Diurnal Occurrences*—*A Perfect Diurnal of some Passages in Parliament*; *London Intelligencer*, &c., &c.

gious, historical questions, news, sermons, plans, counsels, invectives—everything found a place in them, everything was brought forward and discussed in them. Volunteer messengers hawked them about the country; at the assizes, on market days, at the doors of churches, the people crowded to buy and read them; and, amidst this universal outburst of thought, this so novel appeal to public opinion, while at bottom both of proceedings and writings there already reigned the principle of national sovereignty grappling with the divine right of crowns, yet the statutes, the laws, the traditions, the customs of the land, were constantly invoked as the only legitimate criteria of the dispute; and the revolution was everywhere, without any one daring to say so, or even, perhaps, owning it to himself.

In this state of men's minds, the moral situation of parliament was a false one, for it was by it, and for its advantage, that the revolution was being accomplished; forced to carry it on and disavow it at the same time, its actions and its words alternately belied each other, and it fluctuated painfully between boldness and cunning, violence and hypocrisy. Considered as exceptional maxims and measures, applicable only to a period of crisis, and to be laid aside with the necessity of the case, its principles were true, and its resolves legitimate; but parties do not rest satisfied with the possession of ephemeral legitimacy, nor nations labour with enthusiastic devotion for the doctrines and interests of a day; at the very time that the present alone rules and decides their opinions and their conduct, they persuade themselves that these opinions, this conduct, have reference to perpetuity, and assume to direct the future in the name of eternal truth. Not content with taking possession of sovereign power, the parliament voted as a principle, and as if to define the law of the land, that the command of the militia did not belong to the king, that he could not refuse his sanction to bills demanded by the people, that the houses, without his concurrence, had the right to declare what was law; finally, that it was good and lawful to solicit by petitions the change of customs and statutes in force, but that all petitions for their maintenance should be rejected as nugatory.¹ Notwithstanding the uncertainty, and diversity of

¹ Parl. Hist. ii. 1140.

ancient examples, maxims such as these, established as permanent and public rights, were evidently contrary to the historical foundation, the regular state, to the very existence of monarchy. The king took advantage of this. In his turn, he spoke, in the name of old England, of her laws, her recollections. Able and learned champions took up his cause; Edward Hyde, who remained in London, sometimes alone, sometimes in concert with Falkland, drew up answers to all the parliamentary publications. Rapidly conveyed to York by secret messengers, these were privately delivered to the king, who passed the night in copying them with his own hand, that no one might trace the author, and then published them in the name of his council.¹ Written with talent and perspicuity, sometimes with cutting irony, they more particularly aimed at exposing the subtle machinations, the artifices, the illegality of the pretensions of parliament. Charles no longer governed, had no longer any actual tyranny to palliate; keeping silence as to his own secret views, his ultimate designs, his despotic hopes, he could invoke the law against his enemies, now, in their turn, the reigning despots. Such was the effect of the royal publications, that parliament made every effort to suppress them, while, on the other hand, the king caused the messages of parliament to be printed parallel with his answers.² The royalist party visibly increased; they soon grew bolder, and turned the arms of liberty against their adversaries; George Benyon, a rich merchant in the city, addressed a petition to both houses against their ordinance on the militia, and many considerable citizens signed it with him.³ The gentlemen of Kent, at the Maidstone assizes (March 25), drew up another in favour of the prerogative and of episcopacy;⁴ a few members of parliament, sir Edward Dering among others, who first introduced the bill against the bishops, openly invited these proceedings.⁵ The royal pamphlets met with great favour; they were pungent, high-toned, in a vein of refined and contemptuous superiority; even among the populace, abuse of the leaders of the commons found welcome and credit; they repeated the sneers about "king Pym," and the "sugar-loaves" he had formerly received as presents, and the "10,000*l.* of the king's money" that he had, it was

¹ Clarendon's Mem. i. 131; Warwick's Mem. 209.

² Rushworth, i. 3, 751. ³ Parl. Hist. ii. 1150. ⁴ Ib. 1147. ⁵ Ib.

said, just given as a marriage portion with his daughter; about the cowardice of the earl of Warwick, "whose soul was in his shoes," and a thousand other coarse imputations, which lately none would have repeated or even listened to.¹ In both houses, the king's friends showed themselves haughty and irascible; men who till then had remained silent, sir Ralph Hopton, lord Herbert, repelled sternly all insinuations offensive to his honour. It was clear that in the opinion of many his cause was gaining ground, and that they would uphold it, on occasion, for they no longer hesitated to adopt it. Parliament took the alarm; the self-love of the leaders was touched; nursed in popularity, they could not patiently endure insult and contempt, or that in this war of the pen the advantage should remain with their enemies. To this new danger, as much from personal anger as from policy, they opposed utter tyranny; all freedom of discussion ceased; sir Ralph Hopton was sent to the Tower (March 7),² lord Herbert censured and threatened (May 20),³ George Benyon and sir Edward Dering impeached (March 31 and April 26),⁴ the petition of the county of Kent thrown under the table (March 25).⁵ There was a rumour that it was going to be presented again; Cromwell hastened to inform the commons of this report, and received orders to prevent its being carried into effect (April 28).⁶ As yet little noticed in the house, but more able, and already more deeply engaged than any other in the machinations of the revolution, it was in its external business, in exciting the people, in watching, in denouncing, in tricking the royalists out of doors, that this man's activity and influence were more especially engaged.

That war was near at hand was no longer doubtful; the two parties could no longer live together, or sit within the same walls. Every day members of parliament were leaving London; some, disgusted or alarmed, retired to their estates; others sought elsewhere, far from an arena where they were conscious of defeat, fresh arms against their enemies. Most of them repaired to the king, nearly all his councillors had already joined him.⁷ An unexpected incident hastened this movement, and irrevocably separated the two parties. On the 23rd of April, the king, at the head of three hundred horse,

¹ Parl. Hist. ii. 1164, 1405.

² Ib. 1118.

³ Ib. 1242.

⁴ Ib. 1149, 1188.

⁵ Ib. 1147.

⁶ Ib. 1194.

⁷ May, ii. 58

advanced towards Hull, and sent word to sir John Hotham, the governor of the place, to deliver it into his hands. Weak, irresolute, far from inveterate against the crown, and without instructions for the regulation of his conduct, sir John, in utter perplexity, entreated the king to wait until he had communicated his orders to the parliament. But Charles continued to advance, and at eleven o'clock appeared under the walls. He had already adherents in the town; the evening before, his son James, duke of York, his nephew, the prince palatine, and lord Newport, had entered it under the pretence of passing a day there. The mayor and some of the citizens were proceeding towards the gates for the purpose of opening them; Hotham ordered them to return to their homes, and, followed by his officers, went on the ramparts. There the king, in person, summoned him to admit him. Sir John fell upon his knees, and in great perturbation excused himself from doing so, on the ground of the oath he had taken to keep the place at the disposition of parliament. Violent murmurs arose among the cavaliers who surrounded the king; they threatened sir John, calling him rebel and traitor: "Kill him!" they cried to the officers of the garrison, "throw him over!" but it was the officers who had decided the governor's resistance. In vain did Charles himself endeavour to intimidate or seduce them; after a long parley, he retired to a short distance, and, an hour after, sent a request to sir John to admit him with only twenty horse. Hotham refused this also. "If he had entered with only ten men," he wrote to the parliament, "I should no longer have been master of the town." The king returned to the foot of the rampart, caused Hotham and his adherents to be proclaimed traitors, and the same day addressed a message to parliament demanding justice for such an outrage.¹

The parliament fully adopted all the governor had done, and returned for answer to the king, that neither the fortresses nor arsenals of the kingdom were personal property, which he could claim in virtue of any law, as a citizen could his field or his house; that the care of these places had been vested in him for the safety of the kingdom, and that the

¹ Clarendon, i. 792; Rushworth, i. 3, 567; Parl. Hist. ii. 1197, in which is to be seen the letter written by Hotham himself, giving the parliament an account of the event.

same motive might authorize parliament to assume that charge.¹ The answer, frank and legitimate enough, was equivalent to a declaration of war. It was considered as such by both parties. Thirty-two lords, and more than sixty members of the commons, Mr. Hyde, among others, departed for York.² The earls of Essex and Holland, the one lord-chamberlain, the other first gentleman of the bed-chamber, received orders from the king to join him; he wished to secure their persons, and deprive parliament of their support. With the sanction of the house, they refused to obey, and were forthwith deprived of their offices.³ The chancellor, Littleton, after long and pusillanimous hesitation, sent the great seal to the king, and got away himself the next day. This produced much sensation in London, where legal government was generally considered inherent in the possessor of the great seal. The peers were agitated and ready to give way. But the energy of the commons prevented all indecision. The absent members were summoned to return (May 25 and June 2);⁴ on the formal refusal of nine lords to do so, they were at once impeached (June 15);⁵ every citizen was forbidden to take up arms at the command of the king (May 17);⁶ directions were sent into every county for the immediate organization of the militia (June 4);⁷ in many places it met and exercised spontaneously. The transfer of the stores of Hull to London was ordered, and, notwithstanding all obstacles, accomplished.⁸ The king had ordered the Westminster assizes to be held at York, in order to concentrate around him all legal government; but the parliament opposed the order, and was obeyed.⁹ Finally, the commons appointed a committee to negotiate a loan in the city, without any statement as to its intended application (May 31);¹⁰ and commissioners were dispatched to

¹ Parl. Hist. ii. 1188, &c.

² May, *ut sup.*; Clarendon's Mem. i. 174. On June 16, 1642, a formal appeal to the house of commons certified the absence of sixty-five members to be without any known and legitimate excuse; it was proposed that they should not re-enter the house till they had justified the motives of their absence; and this motion passed by a majority of fifty-five; some proposed that they should each be fined twenty-five pounds; but this proposition was negatived by a majority of twenty-five; Parl. Hist. ii. 1373.

³ Parl. Hist. ii. 1171; Clarendon, i. 739. ⁴ Parl. Hist. ii. 1206, 1327.

⁵ Ib. 1368.

⁶ Ib. 1235.

⁷ Ib. 1328.

⁸ Ib. 1319.

⁹ Ib. 1233.

¹⁰ Ib. 1323.

York, all rich and influential gentlemen of the county, with orders to reside near the king, despite anything he might say to the contrary, and to send word to parliament of whatever they should observe (May 2).¹

The firmness of the commissioners was equal to the perils of their mission: "Gentlemen," said the king, when they arrived (May 9),² "what do you want here? I command you to depart." On their refusal: "If you will positively disobey me," said he, "I advise you not to make any party, or hinder my service in the country, for if you do, I'll clap you up." They answered respectfully, but remained, daily insulted, often threatened, seldom at liberty to go out, but managing to get information as to all that was passing, and to send the intelligence up to London. All York, like all London, was in active motion; the king began to levy a guard; but not venturing absolutely to command this service, he had called together the gentlemen of the neighbourhood, that he might obtain it from their zeal.³ The meeting was numerous and noisy (May 15);⁴ loud acclamations greeted every word the king said; the parliamentary commissioners were hooted when they made their appearance. But that same day there came to York several thousand freeholders and farmers, whom the grandees had not thought fit to summon; they had, they said, the same right as the gentlemen to deliberate on the affairs of the county, and presented themselves, accordingly, at the door of the hall in which the royalists had assembled. Entrance was denied them; they assembled elsewhere, and protested against the measures they heard were being resolved upon by the gentry. Even the latter were divided; for to the proposition for levying a guard, more than fifty gentlemen replied by a refusal, signed with their names; at the head of the list appeared sir Thomas Fairfax, then young and unknown, but at heart the brave and sincere patriot he afterwards proved himself.⁵ Charles, intimidated at this aspect

¹ These commissioners were the lords Howard and Fairfax, sir Hugh Cholmondley, sir Henry Cholmondley, and sir Philip Stapleton; *Parl. Hist.* ii. 1206, 1210, 1212.

² *Parl. Hist.* ii. 1222; Clarendon, 249.

³ Clarendon, i. 832.

⁴ *May*, ii. 54.

⁵ From a letter of the York committee, dated May 13; *Parl. Hist.* ii. 1226, 1233.

of affairs, announced another meeting, to which all the freeholders should be summoned: the parliament commissioners were forbidden to attend, but the meeting being held on Heyworth Moor (June 3), near their residence, their friends brought them word what was passing, and sought their advice how to proceed. More than forty thousand men were present, freeholders, farmers, citizens, on foot, on horseback, some in groups, others running to and fro to collect their friends. The cavaliers soon perceived that a petition was circulating amongst them, beseeching the king to banish all thought of war, and to reconcile himself with the parliament. They burst into invective and menaces, rode violently in upon the groups, snatching the copies of the petition from the hands of those who were reading it, and declaring that the king would not receive it.¹ Charles arrived, annoyed and perplexed, not knowing what to say to this multitude, whose presence and turbulence already offended his impracticable hauteur. Having read a cold, equivocal declaration, he was hastily withdrawing to avoid any reply, when young Fairfax, managing to get near him, fell suddenly on one knee, and placed the people's petition on the pommel of his saddle, thus braving, even at his feet, the king's displeasure, who urged his horse roughly against him, to force him to retire, but in vain.²

So much boldness in the king's presence, in the county most devoted to his cause, intimidated the royalists, particularly those just arrived from London, with their minds full of the power and energy of parliament. It was quite enough, they thought, to have given the king so perilous a token of their zeal as to come and join him; they did not wish to compromise themselves further, and, once at York, showed themselves cold and timid.³ Charles requested from them a declaration of the motives which had constrained them to leave London; he wanted it for the purpose of showing that after so much tumult, such violence, the parliament being no longer free had ceased to be legal. They signed it, but the

¹ In the sixth letter of the York committee to the parliament, dated June 4; and in a letter of sir John Bouchier to his cousin sir Thomas Barrington, member of the house of commons of the same date; *Parl. Hist.* ii. 1845, 1858.

² Carte's *Life of Ormond*, i. 357.

³ Clarendon, j. 1021.

next day several of them informed the king that if he published it they should be obliged to deny it. "What, then, would you have me do with it?" asked Charles, angrily; but they persisted, and the declaration did not appear.¹ Notwithstanding the concourse and boastings of the cavaliers, nothing was done; neither money, arms, nor ammunition, not even provisions, were to be found at York; the king had scarcely enough to furnish his own table and to provide for the ordinary expenses of his household.² The queen had sold some of the crown jewels in Holland, but such was the influence of the menaces of parliament, that a long time elapsed before she could send the amount to the king.³ He forbade all his subjects to obey the ordinance respecting the militia (May 27),⁴ and himself gave commissions to the chief royalists in every county to levy and organize it in his name.⁵ But immediately afterwards, to palliate the effect of this measure, he protested that he had no thought of war; and the lords at York declared, by an official manifesto, carefully circulated, that, to their knowledge, no preparations, no proceedings announced any such intention.⁶ So much indecision and deception did not arise from weakness alone; ever since the arrival of the seceders from parliament, Charles had been tormented with the most conflicting councils: convinced that his most secure strength lay in the respect of the people for legal order, the lawyers, magistrates, and more temperate men were of opinion that henceforth, strictly observing the laws himself, he should throw upon parliament alone the discredit of violating them: the cavaliers loudly insisted that delay would ruin everything, that on all occasions it was best to anticipate the enemy; and Charles, unable to give up the support of either class of advisers, essayed by turns to satisfy each.

The situation of parliament had, on the contrary, become greatly simplified; the departure of so many royalist members had left the leaders of the revolution in undisturbed possession of power; a few dissenting voices were still now and

¹ Clarendon i 1022.

² Id. ib.

³ Ib.

⁴ Rushworth, i. 3, 550.

⁵ The first commission of this kind was given to lord Hastings, for the county of Leicester, June 11; Rushworth, i. 3, 555.

⁶ This declaration, dated June 15, was signed by forty-five lords or members of the council; Parl. Hist. ii. 1373; Clarendon, i. 1022.

then heard, but reduced to the melancholy task of deploing and warning; the house scarcely deigned to make them any reply whatever. A decided majority deeming war inevitable, boldly accepted it, though with very different views and feelings. To keep up appearances, a committee was appointed to devise means of preventing it (May 27);¹ proposals of accommodation, in nineteen articles, were even drawn up and formally sent to the king (June 2).² But while awaiting his answer, they continued to suppress every petition for the maintenance of peace,³ and military preparations were pushed forward openly and vigorously. Charles had offered to go in person to suppress the Irish rebellion, every day increasing in violence; his offer was rejected (April 15).⁴ He refused to appoint lord Warwick, whom the commons had recommended, commander of the fleet (March 31); Warwick assumed the command, notwithstanding his refusal.⁵ The lord mayor, Gourney, had the boldness to publish in London the king's commission, ordering the raising of the militia for his service and in his name; he was impeached, sent to the Tower, dismissed his office, and alderman Pennington, a zealous puritan, put in his place (Aug. 18).⁶ The city lent 100,000*l.* (June 4);⁷ 100,000*l.* were taken from the funds destined for the relief of Ireland (July 30);⁸ a subscription was opened in both houses (June 10); each member, addressed in turn, was requested to state his intention at once. Some refused: "If there be occasion," said sir Henry Killigrew, "I shall provide myself with a good horse and a good sword, and make no question I shall find a good cause;" but, having said this, he felt it prudent to retire to his country seat, for after such a speech he could not have passed through the streets of London without absolute danger.⁹ The ardour of the people was at its height; in the city as at Westminster, the withdrawal of the royalist members had discouraged their artisans. The parliament made an appeal to the patriotism of the citizens; money, plate, jewels, everything was put in

¹ *Parl. Hist.* ii. 1319.

² *Ib.* 1324; *May*, ii. 75.

³ Among others, a petition presented at the beginning of June, in the county of Somerset; *Parl. Hist.* ii. 1366.

⁴ *Parl. Hist.* ii. 1169.

⁵ *Ib.* 1184; *May*, ii. 94.

⁶ *Parl. Hist.* ii. 1203; *State Trials*, iv. 159. ⁷ *Parl. Hist.* ii. 1328.

⁸ *May*, ii. 121; *Parl. Hist.* ii. 1443.

⁹ *Clarendon*, i. 1016.

requisition to equip some squadrons of horse, under the promise of interest at eight per cent. The pulpits resounded with the exhortations of the preachers; the amount realized exceeded the demands of the most enthusiastic, the expectations of the most sanguine; during ten whole days there was a constant influx of plate to Guildhall; there were not enough men to receive it, not room enough to hold it; poor women brought their wedding-rings, their gold or silver hair-pins; numbers had to wait a long time before their offerings could be taken out of their hands. Informed of this success on the part of the commons, Charles was willing to attempt the same means; but enthusiasm is not a matter of imitation. The university of Oxford sent its plate to the king; following its example, Cambridge, also, had its plate packed up; part of it, indeed, was already gone, when Cromwell, ever vigilant, arrived suddenly, and prevented them from sending away any more.² The king's commissioners had the greatest difficulty in collecting, from one country-seat to another, a few trifling contributions; and, scoffing at the niggards, a futile and dangerous gratification for a defeated court, was the only consolation left to the cavaliers.

The propositions for accommodation reached York;³ they surpassed the predictions of the most hot-headed royalists, and deprived the most moderate of hope. The parliament demanded the complete destruction of prerogative, and that power should rest entirely in its hands, the creation of new peers, the appointment or dismissal of all public officers whatsoever, the education and marriage of the king's children; that in military, civil, and religious affairs, nothing was to be done without the formal permission of parliament. Such was, at bottom, the true aim, and was one day to be the inestimable result of the revolution; but the time was not yet come when this substitution of parliamentary for royal government could be accomplished by the natural working of institutions, and the predominant, though indirect, influence of the commons on the daily exercise of power. Not in a position to impose its leaders upon the crown as state advisers, the national party

¹ May, iii. 81; Clarendon, i. 1016; Whitelocke, 60.

² May, ii. 108; Parl. Hist. ii. 1453; Querela Cantabrigiensis, (1685,) 182; Barwick's Life, (1724,) 24.

³ They were presented to the king on the 17th of June.

felt itself constrained to subject the crown officially to its dominion, convinced it could not otherwise be secure; a fallacious and impracticable method, calculated to no other end than to plunge the state in anarchy, but at this time the only plan which its ablest members could devise. Reading the proposals, the king's eyes flashed with anger, his countenance was suffused with a deep crimson; "These being past," he said, "we may be waited on bare-headed; we may have our hand kissed, the style of 'majesty' continued to us, and 'the king's authority, declared by both houses of parliament,' may still be the style of your commands; we may have our swords and maces carried before us, and please ourselves with the sight of a crown and sceptre, (and yet even these twigs would not long flourish, when the stock upon which they grew was dead;) but as to true and real power, we should remain but the outsides, but the picture, but the sign of a king." He broke off all further negotiation.

The parliament expected no other answer. As soon as it received it, all hesitation, even in form, disappeared; civil war was put to the house (July 9). One voice alone, the same which in the opening of the session had first denounced public grievances, was now lifted in opposition. "Mr. Speaker," said sir Benjamin Rudyard, "I am touched, I am pierced with an apprehension of the honour of the house and success of this parliament; but that we may better consider the condition we are in, let us set ourselves three years back. If any man then could have credibly told us, that within three years the queen shall be gone out of England into the Low Countries, for any cause whatsoever; the king shall remove from his parliament, from London to York, declaring himself not to be safe here; that there shall be a total rebellion in Ireland; such discord and distempers both in church and state here, as now we find—certainly we should have trembled at the thought of it; wherefore it is fit we should be sensible now we are in it. On the other side, if any man then could have credibly told us, that within three years ye shall have a parliament, it would have been good news; that Ship-Money shall be taken away by an act of parliament, the reasons and grounds of it so rooted out, as that

¹ Rushworth, i. 3. 728.

neither it, nor anything like it, can ever grow up again; that monopolies, the high commission court, the star-chamber, the bishops' votes, shall be taken away; the council table regulated and restrained, the forests bounded and limited, ye shall have a triennial parliament, nay, more than that, a perpetual parliament, which none shall have the power to dissolve but yourselves,—we should have thought this a dream of happiness. Yet, now we are in the real possession of it, we do not enjoy it. We stand upon further security, whereas the very having of these things is a convenient, fair security, mutually securing one another. Let us beware we do not contend for such a hazardous, unsafe security as may endanger the loss of what we have already. Though we had all we desire, we cannot make a mathematical security; all human caution is susceptible of corruption and failing. God's providence will not be bound; success must be his. . . . Mr. Speaker, it now behoves us to call up all the wisdom we have about us, for we are at the very brink of combustion and confusion. If blood begins once to touch blood, we shall presently fall into a certain misery, and must attend an uncertain success, God knows when, and God knows what! Every man here is bound in conscience to employ his utmost endeavours to prevent the effusion of blood. Blood is a crying sin, it pollutes a land. Let us save our liberties and our estates, but so as we may save our souls too. Now I have clearly delivered my own conscience, I leave every man freely to his."¹ Vain appeal of a worthy man, whose only course now was to retire from an arena henceforth too agitated for his calm, pure mind. Other anticipations, other fears, equally legitimate, though allied to more headlong, less virtuous passions, imperiously dominated the national party; and the day was come, in which good and evil, salvation and peril, were so obscurely confounded and intermixed, that the firmest minds, incapable of disentangling them, were made the instruments of Providence, who alternately chastises kings by their people, and people by their kings. Only forty-five members in the commons shared the scruples of Rudyard;² and in the house of peers

¹ Parl. Hist. ii. 1417.

² The levying of 10,000 volunteers in London was voted in the commons, by 125 to 45; ib. ii. 1409.

the earl of Portland alone protested.¹ War measures were forthwith adopted; the houses seized, for their own use, all the public revenues;² the counties were ordered to provide arms and ammunition, and to be ready at the first signal. Under the title of *the committee of safety*, five peers and ten members of the house of commons were charged with the care of the public defence, and to see the orders of parliament executed (July 4, 1642).³ Finally, the formation of an army was decreed, to consist of twenty regiments of foot, of about a thousand men each, and of seventy-five squadrons, each of sixty horse. Lord Kimbolton, lord Brook, sir John Merrick, Hampden, Holles, Cromwell, leaders of the people in the camp as well as at Westminster, received commands in it. The earl of Essex was appointed general-in-chief.⁴

¹ Parl. Hist. ii. 1414.

² *Ib.* 1349.

³ The five lords were the earls of Northumberland, Essex, Pembroke, Holland, and viscount Say; the ten members of the commons, Hampden, Pym, Holles, Martin, Fiennes, Pierpoint, Glyn, sir William Waller, sir Philip Stapleton, and sir John Merrick.

⁴ The reader will doubtless feel an interest in reading the history of the commanders of this truly national army; it will be found in the Appendix, No. VI.

BOOK THE FOURTH.

1642—1643.

Breaking out of the civil war—The king raises his standard at Nottingham—Battle of Edgehill—Alarms in London—Fight of Brentford—Attempts at negotiation—Character of the civil war—The queen returns from the continent—Negotiations at Oxford—Distrust of the Earl of Essex—Internal dissensions of parliament—Royalist conspiracy in the city—Death of Hampden—Repeated defeats of the parliament—Its energy—Efforts of the partisans of peace in parliament—Project of the king to march upon London—The project defeated—Siege of Gloucester—Raised by Essex—Battle of Newbury—Death of Lord Falkland—Alliance of Parliament with the Scots—Triumphant return of Essex to London.

On hearing of these arrangements, the king, freed from all uncertainty, in his turn displayed a greater degree of vigour. A small supply of stores and ammunition had reached him from Holland; the queen promised more.¹ The marquis of Hertford, the earl of Northampton, lord Strange, sir Ralph Hopton, sir Henry Hastings, the commissioners whom the king had dispatched to raise troops in his name, met with some success in the western and northern counties.² Goring, the governor of Portsmouth, had declared in his favour.³ The cavaliers were rising in all directions; they spread over the country, entered by force the houses of the friends of the parliament, carried off money, horses, arms, and brought them to York, proud of their booty and of their easy victories. Charles at once comprehended that such disorders would greatly injure his cause, and to repress them and at the same time excite the zeal of the royalists, he made a progress in

¹ Clarendon, i. 1051.

² May, ii. 100.

³ Clarendon, i. 1113; *Parl. Hist.* ii. 1440.

person through the counties of York, Leicester, Derby, Nottingham, and Lincoln, everywhere calling the nobility together, thanking them for their fidelity, and exhorting them to be orderly and prudent; more active, more affable, than was his usual habit, conversing even with the common people, and everywhere proclaiming his firm attachment to the religion and laws of the country.¹ These gatherings, these speeches, the gentry forsaking or fortifying their houses, the citizens rebuilding the walls of their towns, the roads covered with armed travellers, the daily exercise of the militia, all presented the aspect of declared war, and at the same time, at every moment, in all parts of the kingdom, gave occasion to it. Blood had already been spilt in several encounters, more like broils than battles.² The king, by two fruitless attempts on Hull and Coventry, had already given parliament occasion to charge him as the aggressor.³ The two parties equally dreaded this reproach: both ready to risk everything to maintain their rights, both trembled at having to answer for the future. At last, on the 23rd of August, Charles resolved formally to call his subjects to arms, by erecting the royal standard at Nottingham. At six in the evening, on the summit of the hill which overlooks the town, surrounded by eight hundred horse and a small body of militia, he first caused his proclamation to be read. The herald had already begun; a scruple arose in the king's mind; he took the paper, and slowly corrected several passages on his knee, then returned it to the herald, who had great difficulty in reading the corrections. The trumpets sounded, the standard was brought forward, bearing this motto: "Render unto Cæsar the things which are Cæsar's;" but no one knew where to erect it, nor the precise form of the ancient ceremony of the lord paramount assembling his vassals. The sky was clouded, the wind blew with violence. At last, they planted the standard in the interior of the castle, on the top of a tower, after the example of Richard III., the latest known precedent. The next day the wind blew it down. "Why did you put it there?" asked the king; "it should have been set up in an open place, where every one might have approached it, not in a prison;" and he had it taken out

¹ May, ii. 80.² Whitelocke, 62.³ Parl. Hist. ii. 1403.

of the castle, just outside the park. When the heralds sought to plant it in the ground, they found that the soil was a mere rock. With their daggers, they dug a little hole, in which to fix the staff, but it would not stand, and for several hours they were obliged to hold it up with their hands. The spectators withdrew, their minds disturbed by evil forebodings. The king passed some days at Nottingham, in fruitless expectation that the country would answer his appeal. The parliamentary army was forming a few leagues off at Northampton, and already numbered several regiments. "If they choose to attempt a coup-de-main," said sir Jacob Astley, major-general of the royal army, "I would not answer for his majesty not being taken in his bed."² Some members of the council urged him to try negotiation once more. "What, already," said the king, "even before the war is begun!" They insisted, on the ground of his weakness. Four deputies³ proceeded to London (Aug. 25), but returned unsuccessful; one of them, lord Southampton, had not even been allowed to deliver his message personally to the house.⁴ The king quitted Nottingham towards the middle of September, and, notwithstanding his regret at removing further from London, established his head quarters at Shrewsbury, understanding that the western counties showed more zeal in his cause.

The earl of Essex had now been at the head of his army for more than a week; when he left London (Sept. 9), an immense crowd accompanied him with loud acclamations, waving in the air orange streamers, the colour of his house. Whoever wore any other colour was suspected and insulted.⁵ At Northampton he found nearly twenty thousand men assembled. A parliamentary committee was associated with him, which accompanied him wherever he went, but acted under his judgment, and was invested with no counter-authority.⁶ His instructions were to transmit a petition to the king conjuring him to return to London, and if he refused to follow him everywhere, and "by battle or otherwise rescue his majesty, his two sons the prince of Wales and the

¹ Rushworth, i. 3, 783; Clarendon, i. 1127; Lilly, *Observ. on the Life and Death of King Charles*; Mazeres, *Select Tracts*, i. ² Clarendon, ii. 2.

³ The earls of Southampton and Dorset, sir John Colepepper, and sir William Uvedale. ⁴ *Parl. Hist.* ii. 1468. ⁵ Whitelocke, 59.

⁶ *Parl. Hist.* ii. 1573; the committee was composed of twelve lords and twenty-four members of the commons.

duke of York, from their perfidious councillors, and bring them back to the parliament."¹

The petition was not even presented; the king declared he would not receive one from the hands of men whom he had proclaimed traitors (Oct. 16).² At Shrewsbury he had gained strength and confidence. From the west and the north a great number of recruits had at length arrived; to equip them, he had taken, not without resistance, the arms of the militia of several counties; some parliamentary supplies, destined for Ireland, which were on the way through the west to embark at Chester, had fallen into his hands. The catholics of Shropshire and Staffordshire had advanced him 5000*l.*; for a peerage, a gentleman had paid him 6000*l.*; and even from London his party had secretly sent him money. About twelve thousand men were assembled under his banners.³ Prince Rupert, his nephew,⁴ lately arrived from Germany (beginning of Sept.), at the head of the cavalry, overrun the neighbouring country, already odious for his pillaging and brutality, but at the same time already dreaded for his daring courage. Essex advanced but slowly, as if rather following than desirous of overtaking his enemy. On the 23rd of September he arrived at Worcester, at a few leagues only from the king, where he spent three weeks without making any movement whatever. Emboldened by this inaction, by the success of a few skirmishes, and the improved aspect of his affairs, Charles resolved to advance upon London, and finish the war at one blow; and he was already on his third day's march thither, when Essex turned back after him to defend the parliament.

The greatest agitation prevailed in London; none there expected this so sudden peril; the parliamentary party were astonished, the royalists began to put themselves in motion, the people were alarmed. But the fear of the people is easily turned into anger; of this tendency the parliament availed itself. Firm and impassioned in action as in speech, it immediately took measures of defence against the king, and of rigour against the malignants, as it called the royalists.

¹ Parl. Hist. ii. 1471.

² Ib. 1484.

³ Clarendon, ii. *passim*; Mrs. Hutchinson's Memoirs.

⁴ Second son of Frederick V., Under Palatine, king of Bohemia, and of Elizabeth, sister to Charles I.

All who had not subscribed to the voluntary contributions, were taxed an arbitrary amount, and at once called upon to pay; those who refused were sent to prison; the suspected were disarmed: requisitions of every kind took place; all the stables in the town and suburbs were visited, and the horses fit for service seized. Fortifications were hastily raised, a crowd of men, women and children working at them with ardour; chains were hung across the streets, barricades erected; the militia, kept constantly on foot, were ready to march at a moment's notice.¹

Suddenly, on the morning of the 24th of October a report arrived that a great battle had been fought, the parliamentary army totally defeated, many officers killed and made prisoners: the news came from Uxbridge, a few miles from London; left there, it was said, by sir James Ramsey, a Scotchman, and colonel of a regiment of horse, as he passed through the town in his flight. Nearly at the same moment, other intelligence came of a very different character, but equally uncertain: Essex had gained a complete victory; the remnant of the king's army was in full retreat. This news came from people who had been met on the Uxbridge road, galloping with all speed to announce this wonderful success at London.²

The parliament, as ignorant of the real truth as the people, ordered all the shops to be closed, the militia to be at their posts, the citizens to wait for orders, and required from each of its members a personal declaration of firm adhesion to the earl of Essex and his cause, whatever had happened or might happen.³ It was not till the next day (Oct. 26) that lord Wharton and Mr. Strode brought from the army an official account of the battle and its results.

It had been fought on the 23rd of October, near Keynton, in Warwickshire, at the foot of the eminence called Edgehill; not till he reached this place, after a march of ten days, during which both armies, always within a few leagues of each other, had been completely ignorant of each other's movements, had Essex overtaken the king's troops. Though he had left behind him part of his artillery and several regiments, amongst others that of Hampden, he resolved upon immediate attack, and the king, at the same instant, had adopted

¹ Parl. Hist. ii. 1478: Whitelocke, 63.

² Whitelocke, 64.

³ Parl. Hist. ii. 1494.

the same resolution. Both were eager for a battle, Essex in order to save London, Charles to put an end to the obstacles he met with in a country so adverse to his cause, that the blacksmiths left their homes to avoid shoeing his horses. Commencing about two in the afternoon, the conflict was fiercely continued till the evening; the parliamentary cavalry, weakened by the desertion of sir Faithful Fortescue's regiment, which, at the moment of charging went over in a body to the enemy, were put to flight by prince Rupert; but in his reckless hot-headedness, excited, too, by the desire of pillage, he pursued them more than two miles, without troubling himself what was going on behind him. Stopped, at last, by Hampden's regiment coming up with the artillery, the prince returned towards the field of battle; and there found the royal infantry broken and dispersed, the earl of Lindsey, commander-in-chief, mortally wounded and a prisoner, and the king's standard in the hands of the parliamentarians; the king himself had, at one time, been left almost by himself and in great danger of being taken. Essex's reserve remained alone in good order on the field. Charles and his nephew in vain endeavoured to persuade their squadrons to make another charge; they had returned all in confusion, the soldiers seeking their officers, the officers their soldiers, the horses falling with weariness; nothing could be done with them. The two armies passed the night on the field of battle, both uneasy as to the morrow, though both claimed the victory. The parliament had lost more men, the king more distinguished persons and officers. At daybreak, Charles surveyed his camp; a third of the infantry and many cavaliers were missing; not that all of them had perished, but the cold, the want of provisions, the violence of the first shock, had disgusted a great number of the volunteers, and they had dispersed.¹ The king wished to recommence the fight, in order to continue his march upon London without obstruction, but he soon saw that this was out of the question. In the parliamentary camp the same question was debated; Hampden, Holles, Stapleton, most of the militia officers and members of the commons, conjured Essex immediately to resume the attack: "The king," they said, "is unable to withstand it;

¹ Rushworth, ii. 3, 38; May, *ut sup*

three fresh regiments have joined us, and he will fall into our hands, or be forced to accept our conditions; the speedy termination of the war can alone save the country evils, the parliament risks, which it is impossible now to foresee." But the professional men, the officers formed in the continental wars, colonel Dalbier and others, were of a different opinion; according to them, it was already a great thing to have fought so glorious a battle with mere recruits; London was saved; but its safety had been dearly bought; the soldiers, still altogether novices, were astounded and dispirited; they would not recommence the fight so soon with a good heart: the parliament had but one army, it should be trained to war, and not risk all at once. They spoke with authority; Essex adopted their advice,¹ and removed his head-quarters to Warwick, in the rear of the royal army, but so as to follow its movements. A few days afterwards, the king, advancing towards London, though without any design of proceeding thither at the moment, established his head-quarters at Oxford, of all the large towns in the kingdom the most devoted to his cause.

At London as well as at Oxford, public thanksgivings were offered up; for parliament, said its friends to one another, had gained a great deliverance, though a small victory. They soon, however, discovered that this deliverance was not a complete one.² Nearer the metropolis than the army of Essex, the king's troops spread over the country; most of the deserters had rejoined their regiments, cured of their first fears, by the hope of booty. Banbury, Abingdon, Henley, places they thought sure, opened their gates to the king, without striking a blow. The garrison of Reading, commanded by Henry Martyn, a particular friend of Cromwell's, and a morose, snarling demagogue, basely fled at the mere approach of a few squadrons;³ the king transferred his head quarters thither. Prince Rupert scoured and pillaged the country, up to the very environs of London.⁴ The city got alarmed; in the house of lords pacific suggestions were made and listened to (Oct. 29.)⁵ Essex was ordered to draw nearer with his troops; and, meantime, the parliament resolved to request a safeguard from the king, for six deputies,

¹ Whitlocke, 64.² Ib.³ Clarendon, ii. 104.⁴ Whitlocke, 64.⁵ Parl. Hist. iii. 1.

appointed to open a negotiation. He refused to include in the number sir John Evelyn, whom the evening before (Nov. 2) he had proclaimed a traitor.¹ The commons withdrew their proposal: Essex had arrived (Nov. 7). The lord mayor called a general meeting of citizens at Guildhall (Nov. 8). Two members of parliament, lord Brook and sir Harry Vane attended, to excite their courage, and exhort them to march out and range themselves under the general's standard: "For he has obtained," said lord Brook, "the greatest victory that was ever gotten; near 2000 (I love to speak with the least) on their side slain, and I am confident not a hundred on our side, unless you will take in women, children, carmen, and dogs, for they slew the very dogs and all;—if you take in women, children, carmen, and dogs, then they slew about two hundred. The general's resolution is to go out to-morrow, and do again as much as he hath done; all this is for your sakes; for himself, he can be a freeman, he can be a gentleman, he can be a great man; he can go where he will; therefore it is only for your sakes he is resolved to go out to-morrow. When you hear the drums beat, (for it is resolved the drums shall beat to-morrow,) say not, I beseech you, I am not of the trained band, nor this, nor that, nor the other, but doubt not to go out to the work, and fight courageously, and this shall be the day of your deliverance."² The hall rang with acclamations; but terror was not dispelled. The king, informed by his partisans of everything that passed, had hastened his march; he was at Colnbrook, fifteen miles from London. The parliament submitted to send only five deputies, no longer insisting on the admission of Evelyn. Charles received them well (Nov. 11), and said that in all places, even at the gates of the city, he would be ready to treat.³ When his answer was read in the upper house (Nov. 12), Essex rose and inquired what he was to do, whether he was to continue or suspend hostilities. He was ordered to suspend them; and sir Peter Killigrew departed to treat for an armistice. On his arrival at Brentford, seven miles from London, he found hostilities renewed. Notwithstanding the negotiation, the king had continued to advance, and had fallen unawares

¹ Parl. Hist. iii. 2; Clarendon, *ut sup.*

² Parl. Hist. iii. 6

³ Rushworth ii. 58; Parl. Hist. iii. 9.

on Holles's regiment, which was quartered at Brentford, in the hope of easily crushing it and so entering suddenly into the city. But the valour of this small corps gave time for the regiments of Hampden and lord Brook, in cantonment at a short distance, to come up, and these, with Holles, sustained for several hours the attack of the whole of the royal army. The cannonading was heard in London, but not understood. The moment, however, that Essex, who was in the house of lords at the time, was informed of it, he mounted his horse, and set off with what forces he could muster, to relieve his men. The battle was over before he arrived; the parliamentary troops engaged, after suffering considerable loss, had retired in great disorder; the king occupied Brentford, but had stopped there, and did not seem disposed to advance further.¹

London was indignant, and its indignation was all the greater from being combined with redoubled fears. Nothing was talked of but the king's perfidy, and his cruelty, for, it was said, he had intended to take the city by storm during the night, and give up its inhabitants, their families, their property, to his rapacious and licentious cavaliers.² The warmest advocates for war bitterly complained that he should bring it thus even under their very walls, and expose to such dangers so many thousands of his peaceable subjects. The parliament promptly turned this feeling to advantage. It invited the apprentices to enlist, promising that the time of their service should be reckoned as part of their apprenticeship;³ the city offered four thousand men, taken from its militia, and appointed Skippon to command them. "Come, my boys, my brave boys," he said, as he put himself at their head, "let us pray heartily and fight heartily. I will run the same fortunes and hazards with you. Remember the cause is for God, and for the defence of yourselves, your wives and children. Come, my honest and brave boys, pray heartily and fight heartily, and God will bless us."⁴ During one whole day and night, these levies of militia and volunteers were successively filing out of London to join the army; and two days after the battle of Brentford (Nov. 14), Essex, accom-

¹ May, iii. 32.

² Rushworth, ii. 3, 53

³ Whitelocke, p. 64.

⁴ Whitelocke, 65; Parl. Hist. iii. 14.

panied by most of the members of both houses, and a crowd of spectators, reviewed twenty-four thousand men, disposed in battle array on Turnham-green, less than a mile from the king's outposts.

Here the discussion, which had commenced in the general's council after the battle of Edgehill, was renewed. Hampden and his friends eagerly demanded that an attack should at once be made. Never again, they said, would they find the people at once so determined, so imperiously necessitated to conquer. For a moment their advice prevailed, and some movements of the troops were ordered in consequence. But Essex gave way most reluctantly, the old officers persevering in their opposition. An incident happened to strengthen that opposition. One day, when the army was drawn up in battle array in front of that of the king, whether in consequence of the royal troops appearing to make a demonstration of attack, or from some other cause, two or three hundred spectators, who had come from London on horseback, suddenly started off at full gallop towards town: at the mere sight of this, the courage of the parliamentary army seemed altogether shaken—desponding expressions circulated, and many soldiers appeared disposed to quit their colours and also return home. When the misconception was cleared up, however, faces regained their serenity, and the ranks closed up firmly; abundance of provisions, wine, tobacco, and so on, sent by the women of the city to their sons and husbands, brought back confidence and gaiety to the camp. But Essex decidedly refused to hazard all on the strength of the public enthusiasm; he recalled the regiments which had advanced, and took up on all sides a defensive position; and the king, who on his part dreaded an attack, having no more ammunition, effected his retreat without obstacle, first to Reading, and then to Oxford, where he took up his winter quarters.¹

So much hesitation and delay, against which the leaders of parliament struggled in vain, had more powerful causes than the wavering attitude of the soldiers, or the prudence of the general. Even the city was full of doubts and divisions; the peace-party loudly asserted its principles there, fortified as it now was by the accession, especially among the higher class

¹ Whitelocke, *ut sup.*; Ludlow, Mem. 26.

of citizens, of many who had consented to war with fear and sorrow, many only because they did not know how to prevent it. Already petitions, while denouncing as vehemently as ever popery and absolute power, called upon parliament to restore peace (Dec. 19).¹ These petitions were suppressed, their authors menaced, but others were sent from the country, and addressed to the lords, who were thought better disposed to receive them (Dec. 22).² Opposite petitions were not wanting: on the one hand, the magistrates and common council of the city, renewed by recent elections, on the other, the lower classes of citizens and the populace were devoted to the boldest leaders of the commons, and ardently embraced every opportunity to excite or uphold them. A tradesman named Shute, came almost every day (Nov. 13 and 21, Dec. 9, &c.)³ to the bar of the house of commons, followed by a numerous train, and demanding, in the name of "the pious and movement party," that war should be carried on with vigour. He was received with cordiality, and thanked for his zeal; but when his language became too imperious, and he spoke too insolently of the lords and officers of the army, the house felt obliged to reprimand him (Dec. 11),⁴ for no one dared to say or even think that the commons could separate from the lords on their side, or triumph without their support. To give the friends of peace some show of satisfaction, it was arranged that the common council should officially petition for peace, not from the parliament, but from the king himself; the embarrassment of answering such an appeal would thus fall upon Charles, and they were sure the answer given by him would displease the citizens.⁵ Accordingly, with the consent of the houses, a deputation from the common council proceeded to Oxford (Jan. 2, 1643). The king smiled when they urged him to return to London, promising to suppress all riots: "You cannot maintain peace there by yourselves," said he; and sent back the deputies with his answer, accompanied by a gentleman whom he charged to read it in his name to the assembled citizens. An immense multitude collected at Guildhall to hear it (Jan. 13); lord Manchester and Pym were present, ready to repel, in the name of parliament, the charges which might be made by the king. At the sight of

¹ Parl. Hist. iii. 43 ² Ib. 46. ³ Ib. 12, &c. ⁴ Ib. 38. ⁵ Ib. 39.

this noisy multitude, the king's commissioner was frightened, and wished to be excused from reading the letter himself, alleging the weakness of his voice. Imperatively summoned to discharge his duty, he obeyed, and was even forced to read the answer twice, in two different halls, that every one might hear it. After the second reading, a few royalists, who had doubtfully stationed themselves near the door, hazarded some cheers, at once drowned by violent murmurs. The king's letter was long and bitter, full of recriminations, which gave no indication of a wish for peace. Pym and lord Manchester replied; the shout "we will live and die with them," arose from the multitude, and all petitions for peace were for a time relinquished.¹ The attempts of the royal party at reconciliation had never any better result; but they were constantly renewed, and kept Westminster, as well as the city, in a constant state of anxious suspense; no one, as yet, thought of putting an effectual termination to them, by those last excesses of tyranny which give to parties a few days of unlimited power, soon punished by long continued reverses. The parliament, intent upon struggling against this inward evil, could not outwardly display its full energy, nor direct it freely to other conflicts.

In the counties it was otherwise; there nothing stood in the way of parties, no general and decisive responsibility was attached to their acts; and political necessities and calculations neither regulated nor intimidated their passions. Thus, while in the neighbourhood of London the war between the parliament and the king seemed to languish, elsewhere, between the parliamentarians and royalists, it broke forth spontaneous and energetic, openly carried on in each locality by the inhabitants on their own account, and almost without attention to what was passing between Oxford and the metropolis. Scarce six months had elapsed, before the country was covered with warlike confederations, freely entered into, either in the interior of particular counties by men holding the same opinions, or between neighbouring counties, to support their common cause. As a preliminary step, these confederations requested and received from the king or the parliament, according to their views, commissions for their

¹ Rushworth, ii. 3, 110; Parl. Hist. iii. 49.

leaders, and power to levy soldiers, impose taxes, and adopt all such measures as they considered necessary to insure success. After this, they acted separately, and almost at their own discretion, except the occasionally sending an account to Oxford or London of their situation, their proceedings, and soliciting, on occasion, assistance or advice.¹ In default of these local leagues, in many cases concurrently with them, some rich and influential individual levied a small body of men and carried on partisan warfare, sometimes in his own immediate neighbourhood, sometimes at a greater distance, according to his courage, his strength, or the necessity of the case.² In other places, if more pacific feelings prevailed for awhile, they were manifested with the same independence; in Yorkshire and Cheshire, the two parties considering themselves nearly equal, and more likely merely to damage each other than for either to obtain the victory, concluded a regular treaty of neutrality;³ and nearly at the same time, at the opposite extremity of England, the counties of Devon and Cornwall solemnly promised each other, by commissioners, to remain at peace, and to let the king and the parliament fight the matter out as they might (Feb. 1643).⁴ But both the parliament and the king strongly censured these conventions,⁵ and even those who had entered into them had presumed too much on their mutual forbearance. They were ere long as fiercely engaged in hostilities as the rest of their countrymen. In the eastern, midland, and south-eastern counties, the most populous and wealthy, the parliamentary party was strongest; in those of the north, the west, and south-west, the preponderance belonged to the king; in the latter, landed property was less divided, industry less active, the higher nobility more influential, and the roman-catholic religion had more adherents. But in both these portions of

¹ The two principal confederacies were, in the north, the counties of Durham, Northumberland, Cumberland, and Westmoreland, for the royal cause; and in the east, the counties of Norfolk, Suffolk, Cambridge, Huntingdon, Bedford, Essex, Lincoln, and Hertford for the parliament. There were several others, as in the centre, that of the counties of Northampton, Warwick, Leicester, Derby, and Stafford for the parliament: in the south east, that of the counties of Dorset, Somerset, Devon, and Cornwall, for the king, &c.: Rushworth, ii. 3, 66, &c.

² See Mrs. Hutchinson's Memoirs, and those of Ludlow.

³ Clarendon, ii. 206

⁴ Ib. 203.

⁵ Ib. 240.

the kingdom, particularly in that where the king's interest prevailed, the weakest party was still strong enough to keep its enemies in check; and the parliament had this advantage, that the counties devoted to its cause, nearly all contiguous and compact, formed round London a formidable girdle of defence; while the royalist counties, spreading from the south-west to the north-east, from the Land's-end to the extremity of Durham, in a long and narrow line, broken at intervals by districts holding opposite views, were much less united among themselves, had a difficulty in maintaining correspondence, could rarely act in concert, and only protected the rear of Charles's head-quarters at Oxford, a place entirely royalist, but too far advanced in, almost isolated amidst, the enemy's territory.

A war of this kind, in the heart of winter, and in which the two principal armies remained nearly inactive, could not bring about prompt or decisive results. Everywhere and every day, there were sudden and brief expeditions, small places by turns taken and lost, surprises, skirmishes, wherein the two parties were alternately winners and losers to about the same extent.¹ The citizens were becoming disciplined and experienced, though they were not as yet regular soldiers. Some leaders began to distinguish themselves by their courage, their talents, or their good fortune, but none were known to the whole nation; their influence was as local as their exploits. Besides, notwithstanding the ardour of men's passions, the conduct of the parties to each other was upon the whole gentlemanly and forbearing; though the aristocracy was no longer in the ascendant, and the new power of the commons was the true cause of the national movement, it was against the king and his tyranny that the country had risen; the different classes of society were not at war, nor wished to crush each other, either in self-defence or in the assertion of liberty. On both sides, and in most places, command was in the hands of men of nearly equal condition, formed to the same habits, and capable of understanding and respecting each other, even while they fought. Licentious, thoughtless, and rapacious, still the cavaliers were not ferocious; and the presbyterians retained, amidst their harsh

¹ See Mrs. Hutchinson's Memoirs, and those of Ludlow, and May's Hist.

fanaticism, a respect for the laws, and for humanity, of which the history of civil discord presents few examples. Relations, neighbours, friends, engaged under different standards, did not entirely break off all connexion, and lent each other assistance in case of need; though they met opposed in arms, they observed mutual courtesy, as men who had recently lived together in peace, and who were not separated for ever.¹ Prisoners were usually dismissed, upon the simple promise not to serve again: if it happened that they were suffered to depart without their necessities having been properly cared for, even if the king had seen them file off before him with an air of cold indifference, it was regarded as a serious offence;² and the cruel brutality of prince Rupert caused so much surprise and created so much indignation, that even the multitude spoke of him with aversion and disgust, as of a rude, uncivilized foreigner. Thus the war, though everywhere in full operation, remained free from that furious rage which hastens it to a close; both parties, openly and earnestly engaging in it, seemed afraid of striking each other too hard; and there was fighting every day in every part of the kingdom, without the course of events becoming more rapid, the parliament or the king ceasing to lose their time in trivial debates and vain conferences.

Towards the middle of February, however, the queen's return gave an impulse to affairs. During the year and upwards she had been in Holland, she had evinced, in the negotiations of aid, very uncommon address and activity. The aristocratic party was then uppermost in the States; the stadtholder, her son-in law, seconded her with all his power. Confident and adventurous when no pressing danger disturbed her mind, eminently gracious and insinuating in her manner towards those of whom she stood in need, she found means to interest in her cause this reserved and republican people. In vain did the parliament send over (September) to the Hague, Mr. Walter Strickland, as ambassador, to remind the States of the services which the English people had formerly rendered to the liberties of the United Provinces, and to require, at least, a strict neutrality. Strickland, after waiting

¹ Hutchinson's Memoirs; Ludlow's Memoirs.
Lilly, *Observ. on the Life of King Charles*. · Whitelocke, 66

a long time for an audience, obtained, with great difficulty, some equivocal declarations; the people openly manifested their ill will towards him, and the queen continued, without interruption, the preparations for her departure.¹ Four vessels laden with arms, ammunition, officers, and soldiers, accompanied her, and admiral Batten, whom parliament had ordered to intercept the convoy, did not overtake them till they were disembarking at Burlington (Feb. 22, 1643). Batten cannonaded the place; the queen was lodged on the quay; the balls fell upon her house, and even into the room where she was sleeping; she hastily got up, and fled into the country, where she passed some hours hid, it is said, under a bank.² Soon the whole country was full of reports about her courage and her perils. Lord Newcastle came with a body of troops to escort her to York; the gentry surrounded her with transport, full of indignation against the traitor Batten, who had, they insisted, designedly pointed his cannon at the house in which she lodged; a host of catholics hastened to serve under her banner. In vain was this infraction of the laws of the kingdom warmly denounced to the king and to the parliament; in vain, with the hope of degrading or intimidating lord Newcastle, the name *the army of the papists and of the queen*³ was given to his army. Having long since received formal authority from the king,⁴ he contemptuously spurned all these complaints, and retained his new soldiers. He soon found himself at the head of a considerable force. The queen continued to reside at York, less anxious to rejoin her husband, than delighted to command alone, and to preside without restraint over all the projects with which her court was already in full agitation. Hamilton and Montrose came from Scotland to consult with her on the means of engaging that kingdom in the king's cause; Hamilton, always conciliatory and cautious, maintained that it was possible, notwithstanding the decidedly hostile influence of the marquis of Argyle, to gain over the Scottish parliament. Montrose, presumptuous and daring, urged that under the command of the earl of Antrim, a powerful nobleman of the north of Ireland, who had also come to York to offer his

¹ Rushworth, ii. 3, 157; Harris, *Life of Cromwell*. 250.

² Clarendon, ii. 213; *Memoirs de Mad.^e de Motteville*. i. 273.

³ Clarendon, *ut sup.*

⁴ See Appendix, vii.

services, a body of Irish should land on the coast of Scotland, and, joining the highlanders who were to be raised, massacre the presbyterian chiefs; and he offered himself to carry out as well as arrange the project.¹ The queen lent an ear to every suggestion, secretly favouring the most violent, but careful to propitiate all who came to render homage to her power. She at the same time, and with great success, entered into secret negotiations with some of the parliamentary leaders, already disgusted with their party, or influenced by her proximity; sir Hugh Cholmondley, governor of Scarborough, who a month before had defeated a body of royalists, promised (end of March) to deliver that town into her hands; even sir John Hotham did not seem indisposed to open to her the gates of Hull, which before the breaking out of the war he had so rudely shut against the king. In short, throughout the north, the royalists were full of ardour and hope; the parliamentarians, anxious and silent, wrote letter upon letter to London to demand advice and assistance.

The parliament itself felt troubled; at the commencement of the war, it had flattered itself with the expectation of speedy success; the increase of taxes excited murmurs;² there were rumours of conspiracies in the city; notwithstanding the absence of many members friendly to peace, every time peace was spoken of, it found, even in the commons, numerous advocates. Negotiations were not quite broken off; it was proposed to renew them, and as a proof of good faith to disband the armies on both sides, as soon as a treaty should be commenced. Sir Benjamin Rudyard supported the motion: "I have long and thoughtfully expected," said he, "that the cup of trembling which hath gone round about us to other nations, would at length come in amongst us; it is now come at last, and we may drink the dregs of it, the worst; which God avert! There is yet some comfort left, that our miseries are not likely to last long; for we cannot fight here as they do in Germany, in that great, large, vast continent, where, although there be war in some parts of it, yet there are many other remote quiet places for trade and tillage to support

¹ Rushworth, ii. 3, 353; Baillie's Letters, i. 304.

² Parl. Hist. iii. 77; the new taxes imposed on the city of London amounted to 10,000*l.* a week, those on the whole kingdom to 83,518*l.* a week; Clarendon, ii. 256

in. We must fight as in a cockpit, we are surrounded with the sea; we have no stronger holds than our own skulls and our own ribs to keep out enemies; so that the whole kingdom will suddenly be but one flame. It hath been said in this house, that we are bound in conscience to punish the shedding of innocent blood; but, sir, who shall be answerable for all the innocent blood which shall be spilt hereafter, if we do not endeavour a peace by a speedy treaty? Certainly God is as much to be trusted in a treaty as in war; it is he that gives wisdom to treat as well as courage to fight, and success to both, as it pleaseth him. Blood is a crying sin, it pollutes a land. Why should we defile this land any longer?"¹ The motion was rejected (Feb. 17),² but only by a majority of three, and the words of Rudyard were in the mouths of many well-disposed persons. The leaders of the commons secretly shuddered at seeing themselves driven to solicit a peace, impossible except on conditions which would render it fatal to them. Yet they gave way; for few, even among their friends, were so passionately ardent in the matter as not to desire to avoid such evils, if possible; and on the 20th of March, after some preliminary negotiations, five commissioners³ departed for Oxford, charged to discuss for twenty days, first, a suspension of arms, and then a treaty.

They were well received by the king; their intercourse with the court was dignified and imposing; the earl of Northumberland, president of the committee, displayed great magnificence: he had brought with him all his household, his plate, his wine; provisions were regularly sent him from London: the royalists visited and dined with him: the king even deigned to accept from him a few presents for his own table.⁴ Among the earl's coadjutors, plain members of the commons, there were several who took infinite pleasure in appearing at Oxford with so much parade. But when the negotiating began, these brilliant demonstrations were without effect; neither the parliament nor the king could accept each

¹ Parl. Hist. iii. 80.

² There were two divisions in the house; in the first the motion was only carried by 76 to 73; in the second, by 86 to 88; Parl. Hist. iii. 79.

³ The earl of Northumberland, sir John Helland, sir William Armyn, William Pierpoint, and Bulstrode Whitelocke. Whitelocke, 66. ⁴ Ib. 66.

other's conditions, for they were the same as those which had been so haughtily rejected before the war commenced, and would have surrendered one or the other party without defence to its adversaries. One evening the parliamentary commissioners flattered themselves they had at last obtained from the king, probably on the subject of the militia, a concession of some importance; after a long conference, he had appeared to yield, and was to give them a written answer the next morning. To their great surprise, it was quite different from what had been agreed upon; and they learned that before the king went to bed, the gentlemen of the bed-chamber, the confidants of the queen, had, in the absence of his ministers, induced him to change his resolution.¹ "If, at least, the king," said Mr. Pierpoint, one of the commissioners, to the council, "would only treat with favour some of the lords attached to parliament, their influence might serve him." But Charles, rancorous and haughty with reference to his courtiers as well as to his people, would scarcely even listen to a suggestion put forward one day of restoring to the earl of Northumberland the office of lord high admiral; intrigues of personal interest were as futile as their success would have been.² The king, as well as the leaders of the commons, had no wish for peace; he had promised the queen that he would never agree to it without her consent; and she wrote to him from York to dissuade him from it, already displeased that negotiations should have been opened in her absence, and declaring to her husband that she would leave England if she did not officially obtain a guard for her safety.³ A petition from the officers in garrison at Oxford, secretly set on foot by the king himself,⁴ urgently opposed the suspension of arms. In vain did some of the parliamentary commissioners, in private conversations, endeavour to excite his fears as to the future; in vain did other commissioners, who had come from Scotland to solicit the calling of a parliament in that kingdom, propose their mediation.⁵ He rejected it as an affront, forbade them to meddle with the affairs of England, and at last made the commissioners, as his final answer, the offer to return to the parliament, if it would remove its place of meeting to some place at least twenty

¹ Whitelocke, 68.

² Ibid.

³ Ibid.

⁴ Clarendon, Memoirs, i. 181.

⁵ Clarendon, ii. 324, &c.

miles from London. Upon the receipt of this message, parliament immediately recalled its commissioners, and by so urgent an order that they felt themselves compelled to set off the same day (April 15), though it was late and their travelling carriages were not ready.¹

Their proceedings at Oxford, particularly their intercourse with the king and the court, had inspired the partisans of war with much distrust. Lord Northumberland, on his arrival, heard that one of his letters to his wife had been opened by Henry Martyn, a member of the committee of safety, a man noted only as having fled from Reading at the mere approach of the royal troops, and for the violence of his language. No nobleman was more tenacious of his dignity than the earl, nor more accustomed to deference on the part of his fellow-citizens. Meeting with Martyn at Westminster, he demanded an explanation of the outrage he had committed; and, as Martyn in a sneering tone maintained that he had done right, the earl struck him with his cane in the presence of several spectators. When brought before parliament, the quarrel was received by the commons with some perplexity, by the lords with haughty contempt, and almost immediately hushed up.² Matters were in that condition wherein every incident reveals and foment dissensions which every one would yet fain conceal. Spring was coming on; whether peace was desired or feared, it was essential to think of war. The same day that the commissioners returned to London, Essex again took the field.³ It was still Hampden's opinion that he should march at once upon Oxford, and besiege and reduce the king.⁴ At Oxford itself alarm prevailed, and they talked of going to join the queen and lord Newcastle in the north. But Essex, either still distrusting his strength; or already uneasy at his success, again rejected this daring counsel, and still encamped between Oxford and London, contented himself with laying siege to Reading, a place he deemed indispensable to the safety of parliament.

Reading submitted in ten days (April 27); Hampden then

¹ Whitelocke, 69; Rushworth, ii. 3. 164; Clarendon, ii. 335

² Parl. Hist. iii. 109; Clarendon, ii. 336, 364.

³ April 15, according to Rushworth; April 17, according to May.

⁴ Clarendon, ii. 355.

once more proposed the siege of Oxford: Essex persisted in his refusal.¹ Nothing was further from him than treachery or fear; but he made war with regret, and, to counteract his melancholy anticipations, he had no longer the pleasures of popularity. Even before the recommencement of the campaign, some anger had been expressed against him in the commons, particularly in the committee of safety, the very focus of the party. The more violent had gone so far as to ask whether, then, it was impossible to supersede him, and the name of Hampden, it is said, had been mentioned.² Hampden was too wise to entertain even the idea of a power for which he felt no desire; whether capable or not of commanding, he only served under Essex as a colonel. But since the beginning of the war, during the winter more especially, others had acquired a more independent and extended glory. In the north, Fairfax and his father, notwithstanding the superiority of lord Newcastle, daily and in every direction disputed with him, in the most daring manner, the dominion of that part of the country.³ At the head of the confederation of the eastern counties,⁴ lord Manchester, it is true, had no opportunity of encountering any royalist leader of eminence, but he had often given valuable assistance to the parliamentarians of the northern and midland counties; well-organized bodies of militia were ready to follow him; and his frankness, his liberality, and his gentleness endeared him to the population there. In the same counties, colonel Cromwell, already famous for various dashing exploits, as skilfully planned as ably executed, exercised over the minds of many men of bold spirit, enthusiastic piety, and of a condition at once wealthy and obscure, an influence which already gave proof of great genius and great power. Finally, in the south and west, the dispersion of several bands of royalists and the taking of seven places in three months,⁵ had gained sir William Waller the appellation of "William the Conqueror."⁶ The parliament

¹ Clarendon *ut sup.* ² Wood, *Athenæ Oxoniensis*, article "Hampden."

³ Fairfax, *Mem.* (1690) 13, *et seq.*

⁴ Lord Kimbolton, known also under the name of lord Mandeville, and who had borne the title of lord Manchester since the death of his father, which took place on the 9th of November, 1642.

⁵ Chichester, Winchester, Malmsbury, Hereford, Tewksbury, Chepstow, and Monmouth.

⁶ Clarendon, ii. 417.

then, it was said, was at no loss for either generals or armies, and if lord Essex refused to conquer, he must make way for some one else.

No specific proposition, no public suggestion even, followed these bitter speeches. Essex was not merely an officer in the service of a discontented party; to him were attached the lords who were engaged in the war, the moderate men who wished for peace, and the clearer-sighted presbyterians, already uneasy at the proceedings of the more daring sectaries. Hampden himself, and the leaders of the political party, though they urged the earl to act with greater vigour, had no design of separating from him. Discord then did not openly break out, but, concealed, it was already in active operation, and Essex very soon felt its effects. Those who were fain to show him outward respect, secretly did all in their power to impede him; and his defenders, thinking they did quite enough in speaking for him, took very little pains to give him practical assistance. Before the end of a month he had to complain of the bad condition of his army; pay, provisions, clothing, all were wanting; suffering and sickness decimated his men, lately so carefully provided for by the city. He made his wants known to the different committees whose business it was to supply them; but his adversaries, more active and indefatigable than his friends, had far greater influence in these quarters; it was, in fact, to his enemies, in consequence of their unceasing activity, that most of the executive measures had been entrusted; the subordinate agents were almost all of their selection. All the general's appeals were without effect.¹ Though the second campaign had opened, no decided change was perceptible; and already the party which had divested the king of power felt that power slipping from its grasp; already another party, though as yet obliged to remain silent, were strong enough to reduce the great army of the parliament to inefficiency, and earnest enough in its purpose to risk everything by giving the present advantage to the common enemy.

Already, too, and under the influence of the same feelings, another army was silently forming. In those skirmishes which, notwithstanding the negotiations and delays between

¹ May, iii. 101; Holles, Mem. 9.

Oxford and London, were every day taking place, the parliamentarians, since the Brentford affair, had experienced frequent defeats. The royal cavalry, more especially, struck terror into the parliamentary horse, and the cavalry was still, as in the feudal times, the most honoured and efficient force. Hampden and Cromwell were talking one day of this inferiority of their party: "How can it be otherwise?" asked Cromwell; "your horse are for the most part superannuated domestics, tapsters, and people of that sort; theirs are the sons of gentlemen, men of quality. Do you think such poor vagabonds as your fellows, have soul enough to stand against gentlemen full of resolution and honour? Take not my words ill: I know you will not; you must have fellows animated by a spirit that will take them as far as the king's gentlemen, or you'll always be beaten." "You are right," said Hampden, "but this cannot be." "I can do something towards it," said Cromwell, "and I will: I will raise men who will have the fear of God before their eyes, and who will bring some conscience to what they do; and I promise you they shall not be beaten."¹ He accordingly went through the eastern counties, recruiting young men, the greater part known to him, and he to them; all freeholders or the sons of freeholders, to whom pay was not an object, nor mere idleness a pleasure; all fierce, hardy fanatics, engaging in the war for conscience' sake, and under Cromwell from confidence in him. "I will not deceive you," said he, "nor make you believe, as my commission has it, that you are going to fight for the king and parliament: if the king were before me I would as soon shoot him as another; if your conscience will not allow you to do as much, go and serve elsewhere."² The majority did not hesitate a moment; and they were no sooner enlisted, than all the comforts of domestic, and all the licence of military life, were alike interdicted them; subjected to the most severe discipline, compelled to keep their horses and arms in perfect order, often sleeping in the open air, passing almost without relaxation from the duties of military service to

¹ This conversation is related in a pamphlet of the time, entitled "Monarchy asserted to be the best form of government, in a conference at Whitehall between Oliver and a committee of parliament." London, 1660. 8vo.

² Mem. of the Protectoral House, &c., by Mark Noble, (1787,) i. 271.

exercises of piety, their leader insisted upon their devoting themselves to their new calling as earnestly as to their cause, and that the free energy of fanaticism should in them be combined with the disciplined firmness of the soldier.¹ When the campaign opened, fourteen squadrons of such volunteers, forming a body of about a thousand horse, marched under the orders of Cromwell.²

A month passed almost without any incident. The taking of Reading, so little thought of in London, had excited the greatest alarm at Oxford, and the king, instead of acting, was deliberating whether he should not take to flight. The parliament, embarrassed with its internal dissensions, was more occupied with these than about its enemies. Now, it sought to satisfy at once all its adherents, violent and moderate, politicians and devotees; now, decisive resolutions, obtained with great difficulty by one party, remained without effect, and as if abandoned by common consent. The presbyterians had long demanded, and had been promised an assembly of divines to reform, at length, the church: it was convoked;³ but parliament itself named one hundred and twenty-one of the members; associated with them thirty laymen, ten lords, and twenty members of the commons, with the honours of precedence; ecclesiastics of all sorts of opinions were summoned; and, without authority or independence, the assembly had merely to give its advice on the questions which the houses of parliament, or one of them, thought fit to propose.⁴ A charge of high treason was brought against the queen, and no one raised his voice against it; but after Pym had carried it to the upper house (May 23), it was no more heard of.⁵ The absence of the great seal daily impeded the administration of justice and other public and private business. To put an end to this inconvenience, and moreover, to assume to themselves the legal attributes of sovereignty, the commons ordered a new great seal to be prepared (middle of May); but the lords refused their assent to this proceeding, more afraid

¹ Whitelocke, p. 68; *Mercurius Pragmaticus*, of the 30th of May, 1648; Bates. "Flenchus motuum nuperorum," part 2, p. 220.

² May, ii. 80.

³ By a resolution of parliament of the 12th of June, 1643; they began to sit on the 1st of July following.

⁴ Neal, iii. 43.

⁵ Rushworth, ii. 3, 321

of usurping the emblems of sovereign power than of exercising it without this sanction; and many of the commons thought it prudent to add their entreaties.¹ Sometimes the various parties, voting together with different views, combined in a deceptive and barren unanimity; more frequently, of nearly equal strength, they reduced each other to incapacity, and seemed to wait till some external circumstance should force them to unite or separate for ever.

On the 31st of May, a fast day, in the church of St. Margaret's, Westminster, both houses were listening to a sermon: a note was delivered to Pym, who rose immediately, and after a very animated but whispered conversation with those around him, waiting not for the end of the service, hastily went out with his principal colleagues, leaving the congregation in a state of excitement commensurate with their ignorance and their curiosity.²

The sermon over, the houses met, and the public learned that a wide-spread conspiracy had just been discovered; several lords, it was said, several members of the commons, and a great number of citizens were concerned in it. They had designed to arm the royalists, to seize upon the Tower, the arsenals, and the principal military posts, to arrest the leaders of both houses, and finally, to introduce the king's troops into London. That very day, May 31st, had been named for the execution of the plot. The whole matter, however, it was added, would soon be cleared up, for a committee of inquiry had been appointed, and already several persons were mentioned as having been arrested by their command.³

And, in point of fact, in the course of that night and the next day, Edmund Waller, a member of the commons, and a poet of celebrity, Mr. Tomkins, his brother-in-law, formerly attached to the queen's household, Mr. Challoner, a rich citizen, and several others were arrested and examined. All of them acknowledged, with more or less of detail, the existence of a plot, the extent and purport of which, however, were very differently apprehended by the various conspirators. Some had only contemplated the refusing to pay taxes,

¹ Parl. Hist. iii. 115; May, iii.

² Clarendon, ii. 378.

³ *Ib.*; State Trials, iv. 627.

in order to necessitate peace; others wanted to present to both houses, simultaneously and in great numbers, pacific petitions; others had only been present at some meetings, or assisted in drawing up certain lists wherein were set forth the names of all the ascertained citizens, distributing them into three classes, the 'well-meaning, the moderate, and the enemies.' But amidst these various notions and motives, the plot, long since formed, had daily gained ground. It was now called to mind, that more than three months before, in one of those negotiations so often resumed and broken off, Waller had been one of the commissioners sent to Oxford, and that on the day of their presentation, he being the last introduced, the king had received him with particular condescension, saying: "Mr. Waller, though the last, you are not the worst, nor the least in my favour.¹ From that time a constant correspondence had been kept up with Oxford, in which certain royalist merchants, who had quitted London, to escape the persecution of the commons, were the principal agents;² one of these, named Hall, lived secretly at Beaconsfield, entrusted with the transmission of messages; lady Aubigny, to whom the parliament had given permission to go to Oxford for her private affairs, had brought back in a little box, a commission from the king, authorizing some of the conspirators to levy men and money in his name; finally, some days back, a message had been conveyed to Hall, "that the great vessel was come into port," meaning that everything was ready; and he had forwarded this intimation to lord Falkland, who had answered: "Let them make haste, then, for the war every day becomes more difficult to put a stop to."³

Here was much more than party-justice needs in the way of proofs; and parliament might, if it had chosen, have believed more. Seized with a basely passionate desire to save his own life, Waller determined to do so at whatever price. He put everything in motion; money, confessions, accusations, addressing the most obscure, as well as the most powerful protectors, supplicating all the fanatics of any influence to come and hear the humble profession of his repentance; as ready to exaggerate the extent of the plot, as he had perhaps

¹ Whitelocke, 67.

² Sir Nicholas Crisp, sir George Bouyon, &c.

³ State Trials, iv. 626; Clarendon, ii. 376.

been to exaggerate at Oxford, the number and influence of the conspirators. Lord Portland and lord Conway had received some secret instructions from him; he denounced them; the earl of Northumberland and many others were compromised by his answers.¹ Though few among the parties implicated had done anything criminal in point of law, many had known and approved of what was going on. But parliament, with courageous wisdom, would not take advantage either of the imprudence of its enemies or the baseness of its accomplice, deeming that justice would suffice for its safety. Only seven persons were brought before a court martial; and of five who were condemned, but two, Challoner and Tomkins, underwent their sentence. They died like brave men (July 5), but without thinking themselves or affecting to be martyrs; even manifesting, with touching sincerity, some doubt as to the goodness of their cause: "I prayed God," said Challoner, as he ascended the scaffold, "that if this design might not be honourable to him, it might be known. God heard me." Tomkins said, "I am glad the plot has been discovered, for it might have occasioned very ill consequences."² As for Waller, who had likewise been condemned, his life was granted as the recompence of his confessions, by the influence of some of his relations, among others, of his cousin Cromwell; perhaps, too, through that lingering respect which is still paid to genius, even when it only serves to render baseness more conspicuous.³

For some days, the leaders of the commons flattered themselves that the discovery and punishment of this conspiracy would throw consternation into Oxford, intimidate the royalists in London, suspend the dissensions of the parliament, relieve, in a word, their party from the embarrassments in which its energy was fruitlessly wasting itself. But these hopes were soon dissipated; scarcely had the thanksgivings ceased to re-echo through the metropolitan churches, scarcely had it taken the new oath of union, decreed in the moment of peril, before parliament found itself a sufferer from greater reverses without, and more violent disputes within.

The king had heard, without much concern, of the failure

¹ May, iii. 45; Clarendon, ii. 370.

² State Trials, iv. 632.

³ Ibid. 635; May, *ut sup.*

of the city plot, for nearly at the same time, he received intelligence that in the south, west, and north, his generals had obtained distinguished success; and he preferred a triumph obtained by the cavaliers and war, to one achieved by underhand dealings with citizens who had so lately opposed his councils. On the 19th of June, an unexpected event seemed to recal his thoughts to London and the parliament. A report spread that the day before, some leagues from Oxford, on Chalgrave Common, in a skirmish of cavalry wherein prince Rupert had surprised and beaten the parliamentarians, Hampden had been wounded: "I saw him," said a prisoner, "quit the field before the action was finished, contrary to his custom; his head was hanging down, his hands leaning on his horse's neck; he is certainly wounded." The news caused a great sensation in Oxford, though rather of curiosity than of joy; they could scarcely believe that such a man should be on the point of falling under so unexpected a blow; they hesitated to rejoice. The king himself, on hearing the news, only thought of embracing so good an opportunity of conciliating, if possible, this powerful adversary, who had done him so much harm, but who was thought capable of repairing everything. Doctor Giles, a country neighbour of Hampden's,² and who had kept up a familiar correspondence with him, was then at Oxford; the king told him to send to Hampden, as it from himself, to see how he was, for that if he had no surgeon he would send him one of his own. The doctor hesitated; "for," said he, "I have seemed unlucky to him in several conjunctures of time, when I made addresses to him in my own behalf. Once when my goods were stopped and robbed, and I addressed him for relief, my messenger came in his house that very instant in which the news of his eldest son's death came to him; and some good time after, falling into a like calamity, I sent to him again; but my messenger met there with another that brought him the news of his beloved daughter, Mrs. Knightley's death; so I seemed to screech-owl him."¹ The doctor, however, undertook the king's commission. But when his messenger arrived on the 24th of June, he found Hampden almost lifeless; he had had his shoulder fractured by two balls, and for six days had suf-

¹ Warwick's Memoirs, (1702,) 241.

fered the most exquisite tortures. He was, however, told who it was had sent to inquire for him, and with what intention. A powerful agitation was seen to pervade his whole frame, he appeared about to speak, but could not, and died a few moments after. As soon as his death was clearly ascertained, Charles was infinitely more gratified than he would have been at finding his antagonist alive, and inclined to negotiate; and Hampden was no longer mentioned at the court at Oxford, except to recal his offences, or to remark triumphantly that he had been killed in the same county, near the very place, where he had been the first to put in execution the order of parliament concerning the militia, and to levy men against the king.¹

In London, on the contrary, and throughout almost the whole country, there was manifested profound grief. Never had a man inspired a whole nation with so much confidence; whoever belonged to the national party, no matter in what rank or from what motives, looked to Hampden for the success of his views; the more moderate had faith in his wisdom; the more violent, in his devoted patriotism; the more honest, in his uprightness; the more intriguing, in his talents. Prudent and reserved, while ever ready to brave danger, he had been the cause of no failure, still possessed the affections of all, and, by his unexpected loss, gave a shock to the hopes of all. Happy and but too rare fortune, which thus fixed his name for ever on that height, whither the love and full confidence of his contemporaries had carried it, and perhaps saved his virtue, like his glory, from the rocks on which revolutions drive and wreck the noblest of their favourites!

His death seemed a signal for the disasters which now for more than two months, successively and without interruption, assailed the parliament, aggravating from day to day the evil as yet hidden, of which they were the result. The enemies of Essex, in leaving his army deficient of everything, had relied, but mistakenly, on the success of his rivals. While the general-in-chief and the council of war who accompanied him were sending messenger after messenger to demand money, clothes, ammunition, and arms,² the news

¹ Clarendon, ii. 300. *

² Parl. Hist. iii. 144.

came that at Atherton-moor, in the north, Fairfax had been defeated (June 30),¹ that sir John Hotham was on the point of surrendering Hull to the queen, that lord Willoughby could no longer defend Lincolnshire against lord Newcastle; and that thus the confederation of the eastern counties, that bulwark of parliament, was about to be thrown open to the enemy. It was still worse in the south-west; in one week sir William Waller had lost two battles; the peasants of Cornwall, those descendants of the ancient Britons, were dispersing, in every encounter, the parliamentary recruits; they had been seen at Lansdown, after having modestly begged permission, to run in upon and take a battery previously considered altogether inaccessible; and a fortnight after, under the walls of Bristol, they mounted to the attack with the same intrepidity.³ In Cornwall, landed property had not, as elsewhere, constantly changed hands; the same families of gentry had lived there for centuries, surrounded by the same families of farmers and labourers; and the people, of a pious and artless disposition, strangers to the new ideas and views, obedient without fear or servility to the influence of the nobility, felt for their superiors and their old customs the same enthusiasm that the most zealous parliamentarians had for their opinions and their rights.⁴ Besides, there and in the adjacent counties were some of the king's most judicious friends—the marquis of Hertford, brother-in-law to Essex, who had for a long time lived retired on his estate, disgusted with the

¹ Fairfax, Mem. 36.

² That of Lansdown, Somersetshire, July 5, and that of Roundway-down, Wiltshire, July 13

³ Clarendon, ii. 437, &c.

⁴ Sir Edw. Walker's Discourses, 50. The services of the men of Cornwall were highly estimated by Charles. In the church of Stratton, and several others in that county, are still preserved copies of a letter of thanks addressed by the unhappy monarch to these faithful subjects. It runs thus:

"C. R.

"To the inhabitants of the county of Cornwall.

"We are so highly sensible of the merit of our county of Cornwall, of their zeal for the defence of our person, and the just rights of our crown, in a time when we could contribute so little to our own defence, or to their assistance; in a time when not only no reward appeared, but great and probable dangers were threatened to obedience and loyalty; of their great and eminent courage and patience in their indefatigable prosecution of their great work against so potent an enemy, backed with so strong, rich, and populous

court; sir Bevil Greenville, the most popular of the Cornish gentlemen, all of whom were popular; sir Ralph Hopton, a worthy man and excellent officer, who sought no favours from Oxford, severely repressed pillage, everywhere protected the people, and while fulfilling what he deemed the duty of a faithful subject, did it with all the humanity of a good citizen. The merit of these generals, the bravery of their soldiers, reflected, by contrast, utter discredit upon Waller and his army, and inspired them with fear; there was no sort of discipline among the parliamentary troops; they deserted in whole companies; even the commissioners sent by parliament to excite the zeal of the people, were seized with the same terror, and communicated it to those around them. The magistrates of Dorchester were one day showing the fortifications of their town to Mr. Strode, and asked him what he thought of them: "All that," said he, "will not stop the cavaliers one half hour; 'tis mere sport with them to scale ramparts twenty feet high."¹ Dorchester surrendered at the first summons (August); Weymouth, Portland, Barnstable, Biddeford, followed its example (end of August); Taunton, Bridgewater, Bath, had already done the same (end of July); Bristol, the second city in the kingdom, yielded to the first attack (July 25),² through the cowardice of its governor, Nathaniel Fiennes, one of the leaders of the most violent faction. Every day brought to London the news of some loss; at Oxford, on the contrary, strength increased

cities, and so plentifully furnished and supplied with men, arms, money, ammunition, and provision of all kinds; and of the wonderful success with which it pleased Almighty God (though with the loss of some most eminent persons, who shall never be forgotten by us) to reward their loyalty and patience by many strange victories over their and our enemies, in despite of all human probability, and all imaginable disadvantages; that as we cannot be forgetful of so great desert, so we cannot but desire to publish it to all the world, and perpetuate to all time the memory of their merits, and of our acceptance of the same; and to that end, we do hereby render our royal thanks to that our county in the most public and lasting manner we can devise, commanding copies hereof to be printed and published, and one of them to be read in every church and chapel therein, and to be kept for ever as a record in the same; that as long as the history of these times and of this nation shall continue, the memory of how much that county hath merited from us and our crown, may be derived with it to posterity.

"Given at our camp, at Sudeley Castle,

"the 10th of September, 1643.

¹ Clarendon, ii. 502.

² Rushworth, ii. 3, 284; State Trials iv. 186

with confidence. The queen had, at length, joined the king, bringing with her three thousand men and some cannon.¹ Their first interview took place on Keynton Down, the place where, the year before, the two parties had for the first time come to blows; and the same day (July 13), at the same hour, Wilmot and Hopton obtained a brilliant victory over the parliamentarians,² at Roundway-down, in Wiltshire. Charles and his wife entered Oxford in triumph; while Waller, who, when he set out for the army, had ordered all the constables on his way to hold themselves in readiness to receive his prisoners, returned to London without soldiers.³

Essex, still immovable, and laying the blame of his inaction on those who reproached him for it, was present at many defeats, without partaking of them or preventing them. At last, he wrote to the upper house: "If it were thought fit to send to his majesty to have peace, with the settling of religion, the laws and liberties of the subjects, and bringing to just trial those chief delinquents that have brought all this mischief to both kingdoms; or else, if his majesty shall please to absent himself, there may be a day set down to give a period to all these unhappy distractions by a battle, which, when and where they shall choose shall be indifferent, I shall be ready to perform that duty I owe you; so that if peace be not now concluded, the matter may be at once ended by the sword."⁴ A few days before, this letter would perhaps have been well received: at the news of the first reverses, the lords had solemnly protested their fidelity to the king, and prepared new proposals of peace (June 16);⁵ the commons, on the contrary, rather irritated than cast down, had summoned the upper house to adopt, without further delay, their resolution on the subject of the great seal; and, on their refusal, had of their own authority ordered one to be engraved, bearing on one side the arms of England and Ireland, on the other a representation of the house of commons sitting at Westminster, without any symbol to indicate the lords (beginning of July).⁶ In

¹ Rushworth, ii. 3, 274. ² Clarendon, ii. 434; Rushworth, ii. 3, 285

³ Clarendon, *ut sup.*

⁴ Journals, Lords, July 11; Rushworth, ii. 3, 290; Whitelocke, 70.

⁵ Parl. Hist. iii. 132.

⁶ Ib. 143; Whitelocke, 67.

such a state of discord, the latter would probably have promoted the pacific views of the general; but about the same time (June 20), the king, flushed with his first successes, officially declared that the individuals assembled at Westminster no longer formed two veritable houses; that the withdrawal of so many members and the want of freedom of debate, had deprived them of all legal existence; that for the future he should no longer give them the name of parliament, and, finally, that he forbade all his subjects to obey that band of traitors.¹ This indiscriminate and violent condemnation at once re-established union between the two houses; on July 5th they voted in concert that commissioners should proceed, on their part, to request of their brethren the Scots, to send an army to the succour of the protestants of England, in danger of falling under the yoke of the papists;² and when Essex's letter reached the house of lords, they resolved that they would address to the king neither petition nor pacific proposals, till he should have recalled his proclamation declaring the two houses no longer to form a free and legal parliament.³

Essex did not press his views; honest and sincere, in counselling peace he thought he had fulfilled a duty; as for the rest, he respected the parliament, and his opinion having been once given, far from assuming to dictate to it, he held himself ready to obey it. For a few days entire union seemed to reign in London among the various parties; all joined in loading lord Essex with marks of esteem; he speedily received ammunition and reinforcements.⁴ At the same time, Waller, notwithstanding his disasters, was thanked for his courage and treated with honour, as a man whose services might still be highly useful.⁵ Orders were issued for raising, in the eastern counties, a fresh army, to be placed under the command of lord Manchester, with Cromwell as lieutenant-general (July 22).⁶ Hotham, whom the commons, forewarned in time (beginning of June), had arrested at Hull (June 29),⁷ before

¹ Rushworth, ii. 3, 331.

² Parl. Hist. iii. 144.

³ Journals, Lords, July 11.

⁴ Parl. Hist. iii. 144.

⁵ Clarendon, ii. 482.

⁶ Parl. Hist. iii. 156; Clarendon, *ut sup.* This army was to be composed of ten thousand men.

⁷ Rushworth, ii. 3, 275; Whitelocke, 71.

he had had an opportunity of surrendering the town to the king, now awaited in the Tower his punishment; Lord Fairfax succeeded to his command (3 July).¹ The commissioners who were to proceed to Scotland were named, two by the lords, four by the commons,² and were requested to hasten their departure. Most of the members of the assembly of divines also left London for their parishes, to calm the fears of the people, and excite them to fresh efforts.³ Every day, in one of the churches of the city, in the presence of a multitude of mothers, children, sisters, a special service was celebrated, to invoke the protection of God on all who devoted themselves to the defence of their country and of their country's laws;⁴ and every morning, at the roll of the drum, crowds of citizens, men and women, rich and poor, went forth to work at the fortifications.⁵ Never in the house and among the people had so much energy been displayed, with so much prudence and unanimity.

But the danger still increased; the king's successes augmented in every direction. Notwithstanding the public excitement, some men refused to compromise themselves any more for the parliament; lord Grey of Wark, one of the commissioners appointed by the upper house to go to Scotland, evaded the employment (July 17);⁶ the lords sent him to the Tower; the earl of Rutland, who was to have accompanied him, also excused himself, on the ground of ill health.⁷ The commissioners from the commons were obliged to set off alone;⁸ and they could go no otherwise than by sea, the roads in the north not being safe, nor Fairfax strong enough to give them an escort. They were twenty days on their voyage (July 20—Aug. 9).⁹ Meantime, the king, better advised, published a milder proclamation. With hope, the wish for peace returned. On the 4th of August, on the motion of the earl of Northumberland, the lords adopted proposals to the king, the most moderate yet put forth; they ordered that both armies should be forthwith disbanded, recalled those members who had been expelled for joining the king, and left

¹ Rushworth, ii. 3, 280.

² The lords Grey of Wark and Rutland, sir William Armyn, sir Harry Vane, Mr. Hatcher, and Mr. Darley (Rushworth, ii. 3, 466).

³ Parl. Hist. iii. 148; Clarendon, ii. 486. ⁴ Neal, ii. 500. ⁵ May, ii. 91.

⁶ Parl. Hist. iii. 148 ⁷ Ib. 150. ⁸ Ib. ⁹ Rushworth, ii. 3, 460.

the questions of the militia and the church for future decision, the one by a synod, the other by parliament. The next day they transmitted these to the commons, declaring, in a haughty tone, that it was time to put an end to the calamities of the country.¹ Surprised by this unexpected attack, the war party vainly insisted on the danger of thus losing, for the sake of a few months' respite, the fruit of so many efforts, so much suffering already endured. In vain they requested, at all events, to have the matter put off till the answer from Scotland should come. The other parties replied: "It was ill done to break off the negotiations at Oxford; the common and meaner sort of people may desire the continuance of the distractions, but it is evident that the more substantial and rich men desire peace, by their refusal to supply money for the carrying on war. At all events, the sending reasonable propositions to the king will either procure a peace, or, being refused, will raise more men and money than all our advances without it." It was resolved, by ninety-four to sixty-five, that the proposals of the lords should be taken into consideration.²

A violent agitation seized upon the war party; peace, thus sought amidst reverses, was not a treaty but a defeat, leaving all public and private interests a prey to the most terrible fears, destroying utterly the hopes of the patriots who desired a more extensive reform, of the ambitious who aimed at a revolution. It was resolved to use every effort to oppose the project. On the evening of the 6th of August, although it was Sunday, the lord mayor, Pennington, whom the king's proclamation had excluded from all amnesty, assembled the common council of the city; and the next day a threatening petition required the commons to reject the proposals of the lords, and to adopt in their stead a resolution of which alderman Atkins, the bearer of the petition, at the same time handed in a copy.³ An immense multitude, called

¹ In the conference which took place between the two houses (August 5th, 1643), the speaker of the house of lords began in the following terms: "Gentlemen, the lords believe it too visible to the understanding of all persons that this kingdom, with all these blessings of plenty and abundance, the fruits of our long and happy peace, must be forthwith turned into that desolation and famine which accompany a civil war, and that those hands and hearts that should prosper this land, do now endanger it by their unnatural dissensions, &c."—*Parl. Hist.* iii. 156.

² *Parl. Hist.* 3, 156.

³ *Rushworth*, ii. 3, p. 330; see Appendix, No. viii.

together by small pamphlets, distributed the evening before in every direction, backed this demand by their outcries. After having forced their way through this mob, the lords forthwith complained to the commons of its violence and insolence, declaring that they would adjourn to the next day, and then adjourn again, if such outrages were not punished. But the commons had already entered upon the consideration of the proposals of peace; after a long debate, eighty-one voted in their favour, and only seventy-nine against them. The tumult was at its height; outside the people exclaimed that they would not disperse till they had an answer to their mind; within, the opponents of peace violently demanded another division, maintaining that there had been some mistake, and that they would not be thus trifled with. The motion was complied with: the house again divided; eighty-one members persisted in demanding peace; but the tellers on the other side declared their own numbers to be eighty-eight; the speaker immediately announced this result, and the partisans of peace left the house in utter stupefaction and fear.¹

Two days after, on the 9th of August, they tried to turn the tables by a similar manœuvre. A mob of two or three thousand women assembled early in the morning around Westminster Hall, wearing white ribands on their heads, emblem of peace, and sent in a doleful petition, in support of the lords.² Sir John Hippeley came out and told them that the house also desired peace, and hoped soon to procure it, and that, meantime, he hoped they would retire to their homes. The women remained; at twelve o'clock their number had increased to more than five thousand; some men in women's clothes were amongst them, and, at their instigation, a party penetrated to the doors of the house of commons, crying, "Peace! Peace!" The guard, merely a corporal's party of militia, requested them to retire; but this only redoubled their violence: "Give us up the traitors who are against peace, we'll tear them in pieces! give us up that rascal Pym!" They were forced back to the bottom of the stairs, and a few shots were fired in the air to intimidate them; "It's only powder!" they said, and commenced pelting the militia with stones. The latter then fired at them with ball, and a squadron of horse

coming up at the time, charged upon the crowd, sword in hand; for a moment the women stood their ground, making a lane for the cavalry, whom they assailed with imprecations and blows. They were at last fain to retreat; and after a few minutes of fearful tumult, there remained of all the crowd only seven or eight women wounded and weeping, and two lying dead. One of these, well known by the people, had from her childhood sung the old ballads of the country in the streets of London.¹

The victory was complete, but dearly purchased, for it had been gained by fraud and violence; means which disgrace their own success, especially when reform proceeds in the name of the laws and professes to restore their vigour. It was already a common saying, that the king had been reproached with nothing which parliament itself had not in its turn been guilty of. The upper house was irritated, the blood of the people had been spilled; intestine animosities began to surmount every other feeling. The leaders of the commons were informed that a certain number of members, under the direction of the principal lords, proposed to leave London, to seek refuge in Essex's camp, to proclaim there that they had withdrawn from a parliament the slave of a mob, and to enter into negotiations with Oxford. The design failed in consequence of the probity of Essex, who refused his concurrence; and it was a great relief to the party to find that their general had no idea of betraying them.² But the 'ords Portland, Lovelace, Conway, Clare, Bedford, and Holland, none the less left London and joined the king; and the earl of Northumberland retired to his castle of Petworth. Illustrious names, which, though not constituting the entire strength of parliament, had served as its shield and invested it with distinction. Astonished to find themselves alone, some of the citizen-chiefs seemed almost intimidated; Pym himself was accused of holding correspondence with the enemy.³ On the other hand, the most violent demagogues, the most fiery zealots, began to give expression to their secret feelings; John Saltmarsh, afterwards chaplain in Fairfax's army, maintained, that it was essential, at whatever price, to prevent the union of the king and the people, and that if

¹ Rushworth ii. 3, 357.

² Clarendon, ii. 485.

³ Parl. Hist. iii. 105

the king would not yield all they demanded, he must be extirpated; he and his race, and the crown given to some one else. The pamphlet in which this appeared was reported to the house of commons, but Henry Martyn spoke in its defence. "I see," said he, "no reason to condemn Mr. Saltmarsh; 'tis better one family should be destroyed than many." "I move," said sir Nevil Poole, "that Mr. Martyn be ordered to explain what one family he means." "The king and his children," replied Martyn, without hesitation (Sept. 9);¹ a violence of language till then unprecedented, and which the party who gave way to it, were far from being able to act up to. No news came from Scotland; it was not even known whether the commissioners had landed, and every day they feared to hear the king was marching on London, or that he had laid siege to Gloucester, the last place remaining to parliament in the west of the kingdom, and which alone, by interrupting the communications of the royal armies between the south-west and the north-east, prevented them from acting in concert.²

Passions were modified by danger; parties seriously examined their position. Neither the one nor the other was strong enough readily to crush its adversary, and be still in a situation to carry on, with advantage, war or peace. Instead of seeking deliverance, the moderate in weakness, the zealots in frenzy, the former comprehended that before they treated they must conquer; the latter, that to obtain victory, it was their part to serve, that of their rivals to command. All distrust was laid aside for a while, all private ambition postponed. A committee, comprising some of the warmest partisans of war,³ went to Essex (Aug. 4),⁴ informed him of the measures that had just been taken to recruit and make full provision for his army, inquired what else he needed, and, in a word, entrusted the destiny of the country to his hands, with the assurance of the complete confidence reposed in him by parliament. On their part, the earl and his friends applied themselves to war, as earnestly as though they had

¹ Whitelocke, 72.

² *Ib.*

³ St. John Strode, and Crew, with whom, after some opposition, was associated Mr. Pym.

⁴ Journals, Commons.

never formed any other wish:¹ Holles, who had applied for passports, intending to retire with his family to the continent, recalled the application, and remained; everywhere those who had been lately accused of cowardice or treason, took the lead in preparations, efforts, and sacrifices; and their fiery adversaries, now reserved and docile, seconded them zealously, but without clamour. They even, almost without resistance, allowed Henry Martyn to be expelled the house, and sent to the Tower for his last outbreak (Aug. 16),² so firm was their resolution to sacrifice everything to temporary unanimity, the only means of safety. This wise conduct soon produced its fruit; while Waller and Manchester were each forming an army of reserve, levies of men, money, and provisions of all sorts, destined for the army of Essex, the only one at the time fit to resume warlike operations, proceeded with unprecedented rapidity. Four regiments of the London militia volunteered to serve under him; and on the 24th of August, after a solemn review on Hounslow Heath, in presence of nearly all the members of both houses, the earl departed at the head of fourteen thousand men, to proceed by forced marches to the assistance of Gloucester, which the king, as had been feared, had been closely blockading for the last fortnight.³

It was much to his own regret that Charles, after his late victories, had not made a more decisive attempt on London itself; a resolution to that effect had been formed, and on a plan which seemed to promise success: while the king advanced from west to east, lord Newcastle, victorious also in Yorkshire, was to have marched from north to south, and the two great royalist armies would have met under the walls of the city. After the capture of Bristol, Charles immediately sent to lord Newcastle, sir Philip Warwick, one of his most faithful adherents, to communicate this plan, and to request him to put himself in motion. But the lords attached to the king's party were not generals whom he could dispose of at his pleasure; they had received from him their commission, not their power; and, satisfied with upholding his cause in places where their influence prevailed, had no wish, by removing thence, to lose their independence with their means of

¹ Rushworth, ii. 3, 291.

² Parl. Hist. iii. 161.

³ May ii. 103; Holles, *Memoirs*, (1699,) 22

success. Newcastle, haughty, grand in his tastes, fond of pomp and ease, dreaded the fatigue and annoyance of contradiction; and surrounded himself by a little court, whither the elegance of his mind and manners attracted agreeable men, neither wished to lose himself in the crowd of courtiers at Oxford, nor to take in the king's army a lower grade than the uncouth, ill-bred foreigner, prince Rupert. After having coldly listened to the proposals brought by Warwick, he related to him, with great savour, the story of the Irish arch-rebel, Tyrone, who, being taken prisoner by the lord-deputy Mountjoy, and brought up to queen Elizabeth; and Tyrone perceiving the deputy waiting in the privy chamber among the nobility and gentry there, without any distinguishing character of the greatness he held in Ireland, vented himself to a countryman of his, as thus: "I am ashamed to have been taken a prisoner by yon great man, who now in a crowd makes himself so low and common, as to be watching for a woman's coming out." And then intimated that as long as Hull remained in the hands of the enemy, he would not leave Yorkshire.¹ Warwick transmitted this answer to the king, who dared not resent it. Some still advised him to march upon London, and this was the queen's opinion; but he had not much taste for hazardous enterprises, less, however, from fear of personal danger, than of compromising his dignity; already, the year before, after the battles of Edgehill and Brentford, his pride had been wounded, at being compelled, when nearly at the gates of the capital, to retrograde. Many good officers advised the siege of Gloucester, some with disinterested views, others in the hope of a rich booty; colonel William Legge even boasted that he had assured correspondence with Edward Massey, the governor.² The king at last assented to this plan, and on the 10th of August his army, which he commanded in person, occupied the heights overlooking the town, defended only by a garrison of fifteen hundred men, besides the inhabitants.

On his arrival, he at once summoned the place to surrender, giving two hours for an answer. Before the expiration of that time, two deputies from the town, serjeant-major Pudsey and a citizen, presented themselves at the camp, both pale

¹ Warwick, Mem. 243.

² Clarendon, ii. 470.

thin men, dressed in black, and with heads closely shaved; "We bring to his majesty," said they, "an answer from the godly city of Gloucester;" and, on being introduced to the king, they read a letter, which ran thus: "We, the inhabitants, magistrates, officers, and soldiers within this garrison of Gloucester, unto his majesty's gracious message return this humble answer, 'That we do keep this city, according to our oath and allegiance, to and for the use of his majesty and his royal posterity; and do accordingly conceive ourselves wholly bound to obey the commands of his majesty signified by both houses of parliament: and are resolved, by God's help, to keep this city accordingly.'" On hearing this brief reply, delivered in a firm, clear tone, at the strange appearance of the messengers, who stood motionless before the king awaiting his answer, a movement at once of surprise, derision, and anger was about to manifest itself on the part of the courtiers; but Charles, as grave as his enemies, repressed it with a gesture, and dismissed the deputies with these words: "If you expect help, you are deceived; Waller is extinct, and Essex cannot come." The messengers had no sooner re-entered the town, than the inhabitants, setting fire to the suburbs, left themselves nothing to defend but that which was within the walls.¹

For twenty-six days (Aug. 10—Sept. 5), by their indefatigable valour, they frustrated all the efforts of the besiegers; except a hundred and fifty men, kept in reserve, the whole garrison were constantly on foot; in all their labours, in all their dangers, the citizens took part with the soldiers, the women with their husbands, the children with their mothers. Massey even made frequent sallies, and only three men took advantage of them to desert.² Tired of so long a delay, attended by neither glory nor rest, the royal army, in a spirit of revenge, licentiously devastated the country round; the officers even frequently employed their men to carry off from his house some rich farmer or peaceable freeholder of the other side, who only regained his liberty on payment of ransom.³ Within the camp, insubordination, without, the hatred of the people, daily increased. An assault might have

¹ Clarendon, ii. 474; May iii. 96; Rushworth, ii. 3, 286.

² May, iii. 99; Rushworth, *ut sup.*

³ Clarendon, ii. 512.

been attempted; but that of Bristol, of such recent memory, had cost so dear, that none dared propose it. The king only looked for success by starving out the place, when, to his extreme surprise, he heard that Essex was approaching. Prince Rupert, detaching a corps of cavalry from the army, vainly endeavoured to stop him; the earl advanced without suffering himself to be turned from his road, driving the enemy before him. He was already within a few miles of the camp, already the king's horse had fallen back on the advanced post of his infantry, when, in the hope of delaying the earl, if only for a day, Charles sent him a messenger with proposals of peace: "The parliament," answered Essex, "gave me no commission to treat, but to relieve Gloucester; I will do it, or leave my body beneath its walls!"—"No propositions! no propositions!" shouted the soldiers, when they heard of the arrival of a trumpeter from the king. Essex continued his march, and the next day, the 5th of September, as he was deploying his army on the heights of Presbury, five miles from Gloucester, the sight of the king's quarters in flames informed him that the siege was raised.²

He hastened to enter the town (Sept. 8), conveying thither provisions of all kinds, loaded the governor and his soldiers with praise, congratulated the citizens on their courage, which had saved the parliament, by giving it time to save themselves; he in his turn received, in church, under his windows, as he passed along the streets, demonstrations of ardent gratitude, and at the end of two days, turned back towards London (Sept. 10); for his immediate mission had been accomplished, and it was scarcely of less importance to return to the parliament with the only army capable of protecting it.

Everything seemed to promise him a return as favourable as his expedition had been: for several days he had utterly misled his enemies as to his route; Cirencester, with a great store of provisions, had fallen into his hands; his cavalry had sustained with glory several attacks of prince Rupert and his dreaded horse; when, on approaching Newbury, on the 19th of September, he found that the enemy had got before him, that they occupied the town and neighbouring heights, that

¹ May, iii. 105; Clarendon, ii. 516; Whitelocke, 72; Rushworth, ii. 3, 292.

² May, *ut sup.*

the road to London was barred against him, and that a battle only could throw it open. The king himself was at the head of his army, in an advantageous position, within reach of such succours as he might need from the garrisons of Oxford and Wallingford. The country, indisposed to the parliamentarians, carefully concealed all they had. Whatever the chances of a battle might be, they must be incurred, both for the sake of passing forward, and to escape death by famine.

Essex did not hesitate; the next morning (Sept. 20) at daybreak, placing himself at the head of his advanced guard, he attacked the principal height and dislodged the regiments which occupied it. Engaging by turns with every corps and against every position, the battle lasted till night, and was so valiantly disputed that both parties, in their accounts of the affray, took pride in commending their enemies. The royalists were animated by the hope of repairing a defeat which had interrupted the course of their victories, the parliamentarians by that of not losing, when so near its attainment, the fruit of a victory which had counterpoised so many reverses. The London militia in particular performed prodigies of valour; twice did prince Rupert, after having broken the enemy's horse, charge them, without making the least impression upon their close ranks, bristling with spears. The general officers, Essex, Skippon, Stapleton, Merrick, exposed themselves like the common soldiers; and the very domestics and workmen and camp-followers, rushed to the field, and fought as bravely as the bravest officers. At nightfall, each army retained its position. Essex, indeed, had somewhat gained ground, but the royal troops blocked up his passage, and he expected to have to renew the attack next day, when, to his great astonishment, the first rays of morning showed him his enemies retreating and the road clear. He hastened to make the most of this opportunity, and pushing his march, with no other impediment than a few fruitless charges of prince Rupert's horse, arrived the next day but one at Reading, clear of all danger.¹

The violence of this engagement had dispirited the royalists, not inferior in courage but far less pertinacious than their ad-

¹ Rushworth, ii. 3, 293; May, iii. 114; Whitelocke, p. 74; Ludlow's Memoirs.

versaries, and as ready to despair as to hope. Their loss, moreover, had been great, and such as ever makes the deepest impression upon the imagination of a king. More than twenty officers of distinction had fallen, some of them illustrious by their merit as well as by their rank: lord Sunderland, scarcely twenty-three years old, recently married, and already endeared by his qualities and opinions to all the wise leaders, to all the good protestants of his party;¹ lord Caernarvon, an excellent officer, invaluable to the king for the strict discipline he maintained, beloved by the soldiers for his justice, and so scrupulous an observer of his word that nothing could induce him to continue in the army of the west after prince Maurice, who commanded it, had violated the articles of capitulation made with the towns of Weymouth and Dorchester;² lord Falkland, the glory of the royalist party, a patriot, though proscribed at London, respected by the people, though a minister at Oxford. There was nothing to call him to the field of battle, and his friends had more than once reproached him for his needless temerity; "My office," he would answer, with a smile, "is far from being such as to deprive me of the privileges of my age; a secretary at war should know something about war." For some months past he had sought danger with eagerness; the sufferings of the people, the greater evils he foresaw, the anxiety of his mind, the ruin of his hopes, the continual disquietude of his soul, placed as he was amongst a party, whose success he dreaded almost as much as its defeat, everything had contributed to plunge him into bitter despondency; his temper was soured; his imagination, naturally brilliant, various and gay, had become fixed and sombre; inclined by taste and habit to peculiar elegance in toilette, he had of late taken no care either of his apparel or of his person; no conversation, no employment had any longer charms for him; sitting with his friends, his head buried in his hands, he would, after a protracted silence, sorrowfully murmur, "Peace! Peace!" The prospect of some negotiation alone revived him. On the morning of the battle, those around him were astonished to find him more cheerful than of late; he seemed, too, to give a long unwonted attention to his dress: "If I be killed to-day," said he, "I would not they

¹ Clarendon, ii. 524.

² Ib. 233—235.

should find my body in foul linen." His friends conjured him to stay away: sadness once more stole over his features. "No," he said, "I am weary of the times; I foresee much misery to my country; but I believe I shall be out of it before night," and he joined lord Byron's regiment as a volunteer. The action had scarcely commenced, when a ball hit him in the lower part of the stomach; he fell from his horse, and died without any one having observed his fall, the victim of times too rugged for his pure and sensitive virtue. His body was not found till next day; his friends, Hyde in particular, preserved an inconsolable remembrance of him; the courtiers heard without much emotion of the death of a man who was foreign to their ways and feelings; Charles manifested decent regret, and felt himself more at ease in the council.¹

Essex had just arrived at Reading, when a deputation from both houses came to express their gratitude, to provide for the wants of his army, and to inquire his wishes (Sept. 24).² Not only was the parliament saved, but it was in a position to think itself secure from the recurrence of such perils as it had just escaped. Equal success had crowned its negotiations; while Essex and its army were raising the siege of Gloucester, Vane, arrived at length in Edinburgh, was perfecting a close alliance with the Scots. Under the name of 'a solemn league and covenant,' a political and religious treaty, which devoted to the defence of the same cause the united strength of the two kingdoms, was voted on the same day, by the convention of the states and the general assembly of the church of Scotland (Aug. 17);³ the next day, Scottish commissioners set out for London, where both houses, after having consulted the assembly of divines, also sanctioned the covenant (Sept. 18);⁴ and, a week after (Sept. 25), in the church of St. Margaret, Westminster, all the members of parliament, standing uncovered, with hands raised to heaven, took the oath of adhesion to it, first verbally, and then in writing.⁵

¹ Clarendon, ii. 526; Whitelocke, 70.

² Journals, Commons; Whitelocke, 74.

³ Burnet, Mem. of the Hamiltons, 230; Neal, iii. 56; Baillie, i. 381.

⁴ Parl. Hist. iii. 100.

⁵ Parl. Hist., iii. 173; Neal, iii. 62; Rushworth, ii. 3, 475. The covenant was signed by two hundred and twenty-eight members of the commons.

The covenant was received in the city with the most fervent enthusiasm; it promised a reform of the church and a speedy succour of twenty-one thousand Scots; the presbyterians thus at once saw their fears dissipated and their wishes fulfilled. The day after the ceremony (Sept. 26), Essex made his entry into London; the house of commons, preceded by the speaker, went in a body to Essex-house, to compliment him; the lord mayor and the aldermen, in scarlet robes, came to render thanks "to the protector and defender of their lives and fortunes, and of their wives and children." The flags taken from the royal army at Newbury were exhibited to public view; one in particular attracted attention, representing the exterior of the house of commons, with the heads of two criminals figured above, and this inscription: *Ut extra, sic intra*.¹ The people thronged round these trophies; the militia, who had shared in the expedition, related all the details; everywhere, in domestic conversations, in sermons, in the groups formed in the streets, the name of Essex was loudly shouted or silently blessed. The earl and his friends resolved to make the most of this triumph. He went to the house of peers, tendered his resignation, and begged that he might be allowed to retire to the continent (Oct. 7). No public danger, he said, made it matter of duty for him to stay; he had already endured too many bitter annoyances in his command, and he foresaw their speedy renewal; for if sir William Waller were still to possess a commission independent of him, while the title of general-in-chief left upon him alone the entire responsibility, another had the right to withhold obedience; he had too deeply experienced the anguish of this situation longer to endure it. Upon this declaration, the lords, astonished, or feigning to be so, resolved that they would demand forthwith a conference with the commons; but at the very moment, a message arrived from the commons which rendered a conference unnecessary; informed of what was passing, the commons hastened to announce to the lords that Waller offered to resign his commission, to receive, in future, his instructions from the general-in-chief, and not from the parliament; and they requested the appointment of a

¹ Whitelocke, 75.

committee, which should forthwith settle, to the earl's satisfaction, this painful affair. The committee was named, and the matter settled ere the house rose.¹ Waller and his friends submitted without a murmur; Essex and his triumphed without arrogance; and the reconciliation of parties seemed consummated at the very moment the struggle was recommencing.

¹ Parl. Hist. iii. 177; Whitelocke, 76.

BOOK THE FIFTH.

1643—1645.

State of parties and rise of the independents—Proceedings of the court at Oxford—The king concludes a truce with the Irish—Parliament at Oxford—Death of Pym—Campaign of 1644—Battle of Marston-moor—Reverses of Essex in Cornwall—Misunderstanding between the presbyterian leaders and Cromwell—Attempts at negotiation—Self-denying ordinance—Trial and death of Laud—Negotiations at Uxbridge—Reorganization of the parliamentary army—Fairfax appointed general—Essex gives in his resignation.

THE joy of the presbyterians was at its height: the parliament owed to their chief its salvation; their enemies were silenced; the Scottish army, near at hand, promised them unfailling support; they alone, consequently, would henceforth dispose of reform and of war, and might at their pleasure continue or suspend either.

Within the house, as without, in London and in the counties, a fit of religious fervour and tyranny soon manifested their empire. The assembly of divines received orders to prepare a plan of ecclesiastical government (Oct. 12);¹ four Scottish ministers were summoned to work out, in concert with the assembly, the great design of the party—uniformity of worship in the two countries (Nov. 20).¹ The committees appointed to investigate, in each county, the conduct and doctrine of the ecclesiastics in office, redoubled their activity and rigour; nearly two thousand ministers

¹ Neal, iii. 123.

² They were Henderson, Rutherford, Gillespie, and Baillie.—Baillie, i. 308; Godwin, i. 349.

were ejected from their livings;¹ many, prosecuted as anabaptists, Brownists, independents, &c., found themselves thrown into prison by the very men who, a short time before, had cursed with them their common persecutors. In the city, whoever refused to subscribe the covenant was declared incapable of sitting in the common council, or even of voting at the elections of common councilmen (Dec. 20).² The parliament, from the beginning of the war, had ordered all the theatres to be closed, without pronouncing any religious anathema against them; merely saying, that times of public affliction should be devoted to repentance and prayer, rather than to pleasure (Sept. 2).³ The same prohibition was now extended to all the popular games hitherto in use on Sundays and holydays throughout the kingdom; not one was excepted, however great its antiquity, however manifest its harmlessness. The maypoles, which for ages had been erected, as tokens of public joy at the return of spring, were everywhere pulled down, and orders given that no new ones should be erected; and if even children infringed these laws, their parents expiated each ebullition of infantine mirth by a fine.⁴ Archbishop Laud, who had been three years left forgotten in prison, was all at once called to the bar of the upper house, and summoned to answer the charges of the commons (Nov. 13).⁵ Fanaticism counts hatred and vengeance among its duties.

Similar zeal was displayed for war: proud of having had so large a share in the late victories, the presbyterians of the city no longer spoke of peace; a great number of rich citizens equipped soldiers, and even offered to serve in person. One of them, Roland Wilson, the heir expectant to an immense business, and 2000*l.* a year in landed property, joined Essex's army at the head of a regiment levied at his own expense.⁶ Even some of the leaders, who had been so friendly on all occasions to negotiation, Holles, Glynn Maynard, harangued the common council, exciting them to their

¹ The writers of the episcopal party have carried the number to 8000, their adversaries reduce it to under 1600. The estimate I have adopted is that which results from the information given by Neal, iii. 111—113.

² Neal, iii. 66.

³ Parl. Hist., ii. 1461.

⁴ Neal, iii. 139. The fine was twelvenpence.

⁵ Parl. Hist. iii. 183.

⁶ Whitelocke, 76.

utmost efforts. Never had the party appeared more energetic, nor in more certain possession of power.

Yet its downfall was near at hand. Engaged, from the outset, in a twofold reform, that of the church and that of the state, it did not follow both in the name of the same views. In religion its faith was ardent, its doctrines simple, firm, connected. The presbyterian system, that government of the church by ministers equal among themselves and deliberating in concert, was not, in its eyes, a human, pliant institution which men could modify at will, according to time and circumstances—it was the only legitimate system, a government existing by divine right, even the law of Christ. The party insisted upon the triumph of this system without limitation, at whatever price, as a holy and indispensable revolution. In politics, on the contrary, notwithstanding the harshness of its acts and of its language, its ideas were vague and its intentions temperate; it was carried away by no systematic belief, no passion truly revolutionary; it loved monarchy though it fought against the king, respected prerogative though it laboured to bring under subjection the crown, trusted in the commons alone, yet felt towards the lords neither ill will nor contempt, obeying ancient customs as well as new necessities, forming to itself no precise views, either as to the principles or the consequences of its conduct, deeming its aim only legal reform, and wishing for nothing more.

Thus agitated by contrary feelings, by turns imperious and wavering, fanatical and moderate, the presbyterian party had not even leaders sprung from among its own ranks, and uniformly animated by sentiments conformable with its own. It followed in the steps of the political reformers, the first interpreters and true representatives of the national movement. The alliance was natural and necessary to it: natural, for they sought, in common with itself, to reform and not to abolish the government; necessary, for they were in possession of power, and maintained it by the superiority of their rank, their wealth, their intellect; advantages which the most ardent presbyterians never thought of contesting with them. But in accepting, even, in case of need, purchasing by great concessions the support of the sectaries, the majority of the political reformers did not share their opinions or views as to the church; a moderate episcopacy, restricted

to the legal administration of ecclesiastical affairs; would have better suited them; and they accordingly lent their aid to the presbyterians with reluctance, and secretly did all they could to retard their progress. The energy of the party in the religious revolution was thus frustrated by leaders whom yet it neither could nor would forsake, and their union was only complete and sincere on the question of political reform, or, in other words, in that cause wherein leaders and party had neither intractable passions to satisfy, nor absolute principles to carry out.

Now at the end of 1643, political reform—legitimate political reform, at least—was consummated; abuses no longer existed; they had achieved all the laws they thought necessary, and modelled institutions as well as they could; nothing was wanting to complete the work which the defenders of ancient liberties and the presbyterian sectaries alike desired and could in concert accomplish. But the religious revolution was scarcely begun, and political reform, wavering and ill-secured, threatened to become revolution. The time, then, was at hand, in which the internal defects of the, till then, dominant party, the incoherence of its composition, of its principles, of its designs, must inevitably become manifest. Every day it was obliged to tread in different paths, to attempt incongruous efforts. What it sought in the church it rejected in the state; it was fain, constantly shifting its ground and its language, to invoke in turn democratic principles and passions against the bishops, monarchical and aristocratical maxims and influences against rising republicanism. It was a strange sight to see the same men demolishing with one hand and destroying with the other—now preaching up innovations, now cursing the innovators; alternately daring and timid, at once rebels and despots; persecuting the bishops in the name of liberty, the independents in the name of power; arrogating to themselves, in a word, the privilege of insurrection and of tyranny, while daily declaiming against tyranny and insurrection.

The party, moreover, found itself at this time forsaken, or disowned, or compromised by several of its leaders. Some, such as Rudyard, careful above all things of their own self-respect, of the claims of virtue, retired from the conflict, or only appeared at long intervals, and then to protest rather

than act. Others, less honest, such as St. John, or more persevering and bolder, as Pym, or concerned chiefly for their own personal safety, sought to conciliate, or at all events to keep fair with the new party, of whose speedy accession to power they felt certain. Many, already corrupted, had renounced all patriotic hopes; and no longer troubling themselves about anything but their own fortunes, formed in the committees invested with the management of affairs a rapacious coalition, which distributed offices, confiscations, and good things of all sorts to one another. Among the lords hitherto engaged in the national cause, several, as we have seen, had lately forsaken it, to go and make their peace at Oxford; others, withdrawing entirely from public affairs, retired to their country seats, and, to avoid new pillage, new sequestration, negotiated alternately with the court and the parliament. On the 22nd of September only ten lords remained in the upper house; on the 5th of October but five.¹ An order for calling over the names at each sitting,² and the fear of thus having their absence officially verified, brought a few back to Westminster; but the higher aristocracy, daily more suspected by, and more estranged from, the people, became an incumbrance rather than a support to the presbyterians; and while their religious fanaticism alienated from them able defenders of the public liberties, their political moderation prevented them from casting off uncertain and compromising allies.

Moreover, the party had been in the ascendant for three years: whether it had or not, in church or state, accomplished its designs, it was at all events by its aid and concurrence that, for three years, public affairs had been conducted; this alone was sufficient to make many people weary of it; it was made responsible for the many evils already endured, for the many hopes frustrated; it was denounced as being no less addicted to persecution than the bishops, no less arbitrary than the king; its inconsistencies, its weaknesses, were recalled with bitterness; and, independently of this, even without factious or interested views, from the

¹ Journals, Lords. The ten lords present on the 22nd of September, were the earls of Bolingbroke, Lincoln, Stamford, and Denbigh; viscount Say and the barons Grey, Wharton, Howard, Munsdon, and Dacre.

² Ib.

mere progress of events and opinions, there was felt a secret need of new principles and new rulers.

Both were ready, and, to seize the direction of affairs, only wanted an opportunity. Long before the commencement of the troubles, when the presbyterians began merely to display an intention of imposing on the national church a republican constitution, and to maintain in it, under that form, the uses of power as well as of faith, and thus to dispute with episcopacy the heritage of popery, the independents, Brownists, anabaptists, openly demanded why a national church should exist at all, and by what title any power whatsoever, popery, episcopacy, or presbyterianism, arrogated to itself the right of bowing down Christian consciences beneath the yoke of a fallacious unity. Every congregation of the faithful, said they, inhabitants of the same or neighbouring places, who assembled freely together in one common faith to praise the Lord, was a true church, over which no other church could justly have authority, and which had a right to choose for itself its own ministers, to regulate its own worship, to govern itself by its own laws.

On its first appearance, the principle of liberty of conscience, thus proclaimed by obscure sectaries, amidst the errors of a blind enthusiasm, was treated as a crime or as madness. Its asserters themselves seemed to uphold, without understanding it, and less from reason than from necessity. Episcopalians and presbyterians, preachers and magistrates, all alike proscribed it: the question how and by whom the church of Christ was to be governed, continued to be almost the only point discussed; all thought they had simply to choose between the absolute power of the pope, the aristocracy of the bishops and the democracy of the presbyterian clergy; it was not asked whether these governments were legitimate in their origin, whatever their form or appellation.

There was, however, a great movement agitating all things, even those which did not outwardly seem affected by it; every day brought forward some test which no system could evade, some argument which the dominant party attempted in vain to stifle. Called upon, from day to day, to consider some new aspect of human affairs, to discuss opinions, to repel pretensions till then unheard of, the national mind by such work became emancipated, and made use of its new liberty, either to

soar to more extended ideas on man and society, or at once audaciously to shake off all old prejudices, all restraint. At the same time practical liberty, in matters of faith and worship, was almost absolute; no jurisdiction, no repressive authority, had yet taken the place of that of episcopacy; and the parliament, occupied in conquering its enemies, troubled itself very little about the pious escapades of its partisans. Presbyterian zeal sometimes obtained from the houses menacing declarations against the new sectaries; sometimes, the fears and hatred of the political reformers coinciding with those of their devout allies, they employed in concert measures of rigour against their adversaries. An ordinance, destined, according to the preamble, "to put down the slanderous papers, books, and pamphlets by which religion and government had for some time been defamed," abolished the liberty of the press, hitherto tolerated, and subjected to a strict censorship all publications whatever (June 11, 1643).¹ But power cannot stop those who precede it in the movement by which it is itself impelled. At the end of a few weeks, the royalists and episcopalians alone felt the weight of these restrictions; the new sects evaded or defied them; and, every day more numerous, more various, more ardent, as independents, Brownists, anabaptists, antipædobaptists, quakers, antinomians, fifth-monarchy men, pervaded every corner of the land. Under the very shadow of presbyterian domination, the revolution was, at one and the same time, raising up against that party a host of enthusiasts, philosophers, and freethinkers.

All questions henceforward took a new turn; the social fermentation changed its character. Powerful, respected traditions had hitherto directed and restrained the views of political and even of religious reformers; to the first, the laws of old England, such at least as they imagined them to have been, to the latter, the constitution of the church, such as it already existed in Scotland, Holland, and Geneva, served at once as a model and a curb; however daring their enterprises, neither had given way to vague desires, to unlimited pretensions: all was not innovation in their designs, nor conjecture in their hopes; and if they misconceived the

¹ Parl. Hist. iii. 131.

tendency of their acts, they could at least assign an object in them. No decided aim guided the steps of their rivals, no tradition, historical or legal, set bounds to their thought; confident in its strength, proud of its lofty aspirations, its holiness, or its daring, they awarded to it the right of deciding, of ruling all things, and taking it for their sole guide, sought, at whatever price, philosophers the truth, enthusiasts the Lord, the free-thinkers mere success. Institutions, laws, customs, events, everything was called upon to regulate itself according to the reason or will of man; everything became the subject of new combinations, of learned creations; and in this bold undertaking everything seemed legitimate, on the faith of a principle or a religious ecstasy, or in the name of necessity. The presbyterians proscribed royalty and aristocracy in the church; why retain them in the state? The political reformers had intimated their opinion, that if, in the last resort, the king or the lords obstinately persisted in refusing their assent to a beneficial measure, the will of the commons ought, of its own authority, to carry the point; why not say this distinctly and openly? Why invoke the sovereignty of the people only in a desperate case and to legitimate resistance, when it ought to be the basis of government itself and to legitimate power? After having shaken off the yoke of the popish and of the episcopal clergy, the nation was in danger of undergoing that of the presbyterian clergy. What was the good of a clergy? by what right did priests form a permanent, rich, and independent body, authorized to claim the aid of the magistrate? Let all jurisdiction, even the power of excommunication, be withdrawn from them; let persuasion, preaching, teaching, prayer, be the only sources of influence left to them, and all abuse of spiritual authority, all difficulty in making it accord perfectly with the civil power would immediately cease. Besides, 'tis in the faithful, not in the priests, that legitimate power, in matters of faith, resides: 'tis to the faithful it appertains to choose and appoint their ministers, and not to the ministers to appoint one another, and then impose themselves on the faithful. Nay, is not every one of the faithful a minister himself, for himself, for his family, for all those Christians, who, touched by his words, shall hold him inspired from on high, and shall be willing to unite with him in prayer? Who would dare

contest with the Lord the power of conferring his gifts on whom he pleases and as he pleases? Whether to preach or to fight, it is the Lord alone who chooses and consecrates his saints; and when he has chosen them, he intrusts to them his cause, and reveals to them alone by what means it shall triumph. The free-thinkers applauded this language: so that the revolution was carried out, no matter to them by what means, or from what motives.

Thus arose the party of the independents, far less numerous, far less deeply rooted in the national soil than that of the presbyterians, but already possessed of that ascendancy ever achieved by a systematic and definite principle, always ready to give an account of itself, and to bear without flinching all consequences. England was then in one of those glorious and formidable crises, in which man, forgetting his weakness remembering only his dignity, has at once the sublime ambition of obeying pure truth alone, and the insane pride of attributing to his own opinions all the rights of truth. Politicians or sectaries, presbyterians or independents, no party would have dared to think itself above the obligation of having right on its side, and being able to prove it. Now the presbyterians were not equal to this test, for their wisdom was founded on the authority of traditions and laws, not upon principles, and they could not repel by mere reason the arguments of their rivals. The independents alone professed a simple doctrine, strict in appearance, which sanctioned all their acts, sufficed for all the wants of their situation, relieved the strong-minded from inconsistency, the sincere from hypocrisy. They alone also began to pronounce some of those potent words, which, well or ill-understood, arouse, in the name of its noblest hopes, the most energetic passions of the human heart; equality of rights, the just distribution of social property, the destruction of all abuses. There was no contradiction between their religious and political systems; no secret struggle between the leaders and their men; no exclusive creed, no rigorous test rendered access to the party difficult; like the sect from which they had taken their name, they held liberty of conscience a fundamental maxim, and the immensity of the reforms they proposed, the vast uncertainty of their designs, allowed men of the most various ob-

jects to range beneath their banners; lawyers joined them, in hopes of depriving the ecclesiastics, their rivals, of all jurisdiction and power; liberal publicists contemplated by their aid the formation of a new, clear, simple plan of legislation, which should take from lawyers their enormous profits and their immoderate power. Harrington could dream among them of a society of sages; Sidney, of the liberty of Sparta or of Rome; Lilburne of the restoration of the old Saxon laws; Harrison, of the coming of Christ; even the no-principle of Henry Martyn and Peter Wentworth were tolerated in consideration of its daring: republicans or levellers, reasoners or visionaries, fanatics or men of ambition, all were admitted to make a common stock of their anger, their theories, their ecstatic dreams, their intrigues; it was enough that all, animated with equal hatred against the cavaliers and against the presbyterians, would rush on with the same fervour towards that unknown futurity which was to satisfy so many expectations.

No victory of Essex and his friends, on the battle field, or in Westminster-hall, could stifle or even long repress such dissensions; they were as publicly known at Oxford as in London; and all sagacious men, parliamentarians or royalists, took them for the basis of their combinations. From all sides the king received information of, and was urged to profit by them. Courtiers or ministers, intriguers or sincere friends, each had his private intelligence on the subject, his proposals, his suggestions; some urged that war should be pushed forward without interruption, certain that the rival factions would soon listen rather to their private enmities than to their common danger; others, on the contrary, advised that, by the mediation of the lords who had sought refuge at Oxford, particularly the earls of Holland and Bedford, negotiations should be opened up with Essex and his party, who, in point of fact, had never ceased to desire peace; others even proposed making advances to the leaders, already well known, of the independents, with whom, they said, better terms could be made; and lord Lovelace, with the king's consent, kept up a close correspondence with sir Harry Vane, little thinking that Vane, on his side, was acting under the instructions of his own party, in order to ascertain

the state of things at court. But none of these councils was adopted.¹ It was with great difficulty that the lords who had deserted parliament, obtained admission to Oxford at all; at the first rumour of their approach, general indignation was loudly expressed against them; the privy council solemnly assembled, deliberated at great length as to what reception should be given them, and, notwithstanding the prudent representations of Hyde, who had recently been appointed chancellor of the exchequer, Charles, though he consented to receive them, decided that they should be coolly treated.² In vain did lord Holland, the most elegant and shrewdest of courtiers, contrive, by the aid of Mr. Jermyn, to regain the queen's favour;³ in vain did he exert all his ingenuity to resume his former familiarity with the king, now affecting to whisper in his ear, now succeeding under some pretext, in drawing him into the embrasure of a window, so as to have the opportunity, or at least to give himself the appearance of holding a private conversation with him;⁴ in vain, even at the battle of Newbury, did he fight bravely as a volunteer, and offer his blood as a pledge of his renewed fealty; nothing removed the haughty reserve of the king, nor put a stop to the clamours of the court; and finding their services pertinaciously rejected, the refugee lords now only considered how they might best escape from so disagreeable a position. The advocates of a vigorous war were heard with more favour, but with as little effect; the ill success of the siege of Gloucester had thrown Oxford into a state of impotent anarchy and cabal; each blamed the other for that fatal enterprise; the council complained of the disorderly conduct of the army; the army insolently defied the council; prince Rupert, though formally exempted from obeying even on a day of battle any person but the king himself,⁵ was jealous of the general-in-chief; the general and great lords murmured loudly against the independence and churlish uncouthness of prince Rupert. The king, who respected, in the person of his nephews, the dignity of his own blood, could not bring himself to decide against them in favour of a subject, and sacrificed to this ridiculous pride the rights, even the services of his most useful friends. Hyde alone freely endeavoured

¹ Parl. Hist. iii. 199; Whitelocke, 86.

² Ib. 203, 256.

³ Clarendon, ii. 489.

⁴ Ib. 408.

⁵ Ib. 63.

to correct these errors in his sovereign, and sometimes with success; but Hyde himself, new to the court, without any distinction or power beyond that which his office gave him, needed the king to support him against the queen's temper, or the intrigues of jealous courtiers; he maintained his reputation as an influential councillor and wise man, but without exercising any real ascendancy, without obtaining any important result. In short, discord was as great at Oxford as at London, and far more fatal; for in London it precipitated, at Oxford it paralysed the progress of things.

It was amidst such embarrassments, and when, in his heart, he was perhaps as tired of his party as he was of his people, that Charles learned the new alliance between Scotland and the parliament, and that thus another of his kingdoms was preparing to make war against him. He forthwith ordered the duke of Hamilton, who, having regained his confidence, had been appointed his commissioner at Edinburgh, to prevent this union at whatever cost. The duke, it is said, was empowered to propose that, for the future, a third of the offices in the royal household should be secured to the Scots; that the counties of Northumberland, Westmoreland, and Cumberland, formerly belonging to their territory, should be again annexed to it; that the king himself should fix his residence at Newcastle, and the prince of Wales establish himself and court in Scotland.¹ Such promises, if indeed they were made, were obviously insincere, obviously incapable of accomplishment, and even had the Scottish parliament been disposed to regard them as other than a mere attempt to deceive, a recent event rendered such a delusion impossible. The earl of Antrim had just been arrested in Ireland by the Scottish troops quartered in Ulster, a few hours after his disembarkation; and on his person had been found the proofs of a plan formed between Montrose and him, during their stay with the queen at York, to transport into Scotland a numerous body of Irish Roman catholics, to raise the highlanders of the north, and thus make a powerful diversion in favour of the king. The design was evidently on the point of being carried into execution, for Montrose had rejoined the king during the siege of Gloucester, and Antrim had just come from

¹ Burnet, *Own Times*, (Oxford, 1823) i. 61.

Oxford. As on the occasion of his last journey to Scotland, the king then was meditating the darkest designs against his subjects, at the very moment he was making them the most glowing proposals. The parliament at Edinburgh forthwith concluded its treaty with that at Westminster, and sent information of all these particulars.¹

It transmitted at the same time details of a still more important discovery it had made; lord Antrim's papers showed pretty manifestly that the king was maintaining a constant correspondence with the Irish rebels; that he had several times received their proposals, their offers, that he was even on the point of concluding with them a suspension of arms, and promised himself, from this arrangement, the most favourable results for the next campaign.² It was all perfectly true: Charles, while always cursing her, when he spoke to England, had long been negotiating with rebellious Ireland.³ The war, kindled by insurrection, had continued in this unhappy country without intermission, but to no purpose. Ten or twelve thousand soldiers, ill-paid, seldom relieved, were insufficient to subdue it, though enough to prevent it from effecting emancipation. In the month of February, 1642, before the breaking out of the civil war, parliament had desired to make a great effort to put down the rebellion; a loan was opened to meet the expenses of a decisive expedition; and the estates of the rebels, which by future confiscations would inevitably lapse to the crown, had been appropriated, by anticipation, upon a certain scale, for the repayment of the subscribers.⁴ Large sums had been thus collected, and some succours sent to Dublin; but the civil war broke out; overwhelmed with its own affairs, parliament thought of Ireland only at long intervals, without vigour or result, merely to calm, when they became too clamorous, the complaints of the protestants of that kingdom, and, above all, to render the king responsible in the eyes of Ireland for all the calamities that might arise. Charles paid quite as little attention, and made quite as few sacrifices to the interests of his Irish pro-

¹ Laing, Hist. of Scotland, iii. 256.

² Ib.

³ His correspondence with lord Ormond leaves no doubt of it; Carte's Life of Ormond, iii. *passim*; Mr. Brodie has skilfully collected the proofs of this in his Hist. of the British Empire, iii. 459, in the note.

⁴ May, i. 2, 47.

testant subjects; and while he reproached parliament with having appropriated to its own use a portion of the money levied for their service, he himself intercepted convoys destined to supply them with provisions, and took from the arsenals of Dublin the arms and ammunition of which they had such urgent need.¹ But the principal protestants of Ireland, aristocrats by situation, were attached to episcopacy and to the crown; the army reckoned among its officers a great number of those whom, as cavaliers, parliament had been anxious to send out of the way; the earl of Ormond, their general, was rich, brave, generous, and popular; he gained two battles over the rebels,² and gave the king all the honour of his success. The parliamentary party rapidly declined in Ireland; the magistrates who were devoted to it were replaced by royalists: the parliament sent over two members of the commons as commissioners,³ to regain some of their lost power; but Ormond forbade them to enter the council, and at the end of four months felt himself strong enough to compel them to return to England (Feb.) All the civil and military power was from that time in the hands of the king, who, relieved from a troublesome though ineffectual surveillance, no longer hesitated to prosecute the design to which at once his inclination and his difficulties urged him. The queen had regularly maintained with the Irish catholics a correspondence, of which her husband was doubtless not ignorant; the insurrection no longer merely presented, as in its commencement, the furious ebullitions, the hideous excesses of a savage populace; a sovereign council of twenty-four, established at Kilkenny (since Nov. 14, 1642), governed it with prudence and regularity; already more than once it had addressed dutiful and affectionate messages to the king, entreating him no longer to persecute, for the pleasure of his enemies, faithful subjects whose only desire was to serve him. Charles did not, as yet, consider himself in sufficient danger; nor so wholly relieved from the necessity of conciliating the opinion of England, as to accept openly such an alliance; but he might, at least, he thought, show the Irish some favour, and recal to England the troops who fought against them in

¹ Carte's *Life of Ormond*, ii. appendix 3, 5.

² The battles of Kilrush and Ross.

³ Goodwin and Reynolds in the autumn of 1642.

his name, to employ them against more odious and more formidable rebels. Ormond received orders to open negotiations to this effect with the council of Kilkenny,¹ and meanwhile, to provide the reason or at least the excuse of necessity, nothing was talked of but the distress, real enough for that matter, to which the protestant cause and its defenders were reduced in Ireland. In a long and pathetic remonstrance, addressed to the castle of Dublin, the army set forth all its grievances, all its misery, and declared its resolution of quitting a service to which it was prevented from doing justice. Memorials sent to Oxford and London conveyed to the king and to parliament the same declaration and the same complaints.² The negotiations proceeded; at the period of Antrim's arrest they were on the very point of being concluded; and towards the end of September, a few days before that on which parliament solemnly accepted at Westminster the covenant with Scotland, England learned that the king had just signed a truce of a year with the Irish rebels,³ that the English troops who had been sent to repress the insurrection were recalled, and that ten regiments would shortly land, five at Chester and five at Bristol.⁴

A violent clamour arose on all sides; the Irish were to the English objects of contempt, aversion, and terror. Even among the royalists, and within the very walls of Oxford, discontent was manifested. Several officers quitted lord Newcastle's army, and made their submission to parliament.⁵ Lord Holland returned to London, saying, that the papists decidedly prevailed at Oxford, and that his conscience did not allow him to remain there any longer.⁶ Lords Bedford, Clare, and Paget, sir Edward Dering, and several other gentlemen, followed his example, covering with the same pretext their fickleness or their cowardice.⁷ The parliament was quite ready to receive back the penitents. The king's conduct became the subject of all sorts of popular invectives and sarcasms; his so recent protestations were called to mind, and the so haughty tone of his

¹ Ormond's commission was dated January 11th, 1643; the negotiations began in the course of the month of March following.

² Rushworth, vi. 537, and following.

³ Signed Sept. 5, 1643, at Sigginstown, in the county of Kildare.

⁴ Godwin, Hist. of the Commonwealth, i. 279.

⁵ Whitelocke, 76.

⁶ Ib. ⁷ Ib. 81; Parl. Hist. iii. 189.

answers, when complaints had been made of the correspondence between the court and the rebels; every one took credit to himself for having so sagaciously foreseen his secret practices, and was indignant at his having flattered himself he could thus impose upon his people, or imagine such gross want of faith could meet with success. It was much worse when it became known that a considerable number of Irish papists were among the recalled troops; and that even women, armed with long knives, and attired in savage costume, had been seen in their ranks.¹ Not content with leaving the massacre of the Irish protestants unavenged, the king then was actually enlisting in his service the ferocious assassins of the English protestants. Many people, even of a condition superior to the passionate prejudices of the multitude, thenceforth bore towards the king a profound hatred, some because of his duplicity, others on account of the favour he showed to the odious papists; and his name, hitherto respected, was now frequently mentioned with insult.

Speedily informed of this state of things and of the endeavours of parliament to fan the flame, Charles, feeling insulted that any one should dare to judge of his intentions by his acts instead of by his words, sent, in a state of high indignation, for Hyde, and said he thought there was too much honour done to those rebels at Westminster in all his declarations, by his mentioning them as part of the parliament, which, as long as they should be thought to be, they would have more authority, assembled where they were first called, than all the other members convened anywhere else. He said the act for their continuance was void from the beginning, for that a king had it not in his power to bar himself from the prerogatives of dissolving parliament; and, at all events, that they had forfeited any right by their rebellion, and he therefore desired a proclamation to be prepared, declaring them actually dissolved, and expressly forbidding them to meet, or any one to own them or submit to them as a parliament. Hyde listened with astonishment and anxiety; for the mere idea of such a measure appeared to him insanity. "I see," he replied, "your majesty has well considered the argument, which I have not. It is one which calls for very

¹ Whitelocke, 82.

serious reflection. For my own part, I cannot imagine that your majesty's forbidding them to meet any more at Westminster, will prevent one man the less going there. On the contrary, your prohibition may have the effect of bringing back to them many who have severed from them. It may be that the act in question is void, and I am inclined to hope so; but till the parliament itself shall declare this, no judge, much less no private man, will declare such invalidity. It was the first powerful reproach they corrupted the people with against your majesty, that you intended to dissolve this parliament, and in the same way, repeal all the other acts made by that parliament, whereof some are very precious to the people. As your majesty has always disclaimed any such thought, such a proclamation now would confirm all the jealousies and fears so excited, and trouble many of your true subjects. I conjure your majesty to reflect seriously before you carry this design any further."¹

As soon as they heard how frankly Hyde had spoken to the king, nearly all the members of the council expressed their concurrence in his opinion. With all his haughtiness, Charles, in their company, was wavering and timid; objections embarrassed him, and he usually gave way, not knowing what to answer, or how to put an end, even with his own council, to discussions which displeased him. After a few days of hesitation, more apparent than real, the project was abandoned. Yet some decisive measure seemed necessary, if only to keep the royalist party on the alert, and not to leave the parliament, in this interval of peace, the advantage of engrossing the impatient activity of men's minds. Some one proposed, since the name of parliament exercised such an influence over the people, to assemble at Oxford all those members of both houses who had withdrawn from Westminster Hall, and thus oppose to a factious and broken-up parliament, a parliament undoubtedly legal and regular, since the king would form part of it. The proposal did not please Charles; a parliament, however royalist, was matter of suspicion and distaste to him; he must then listen to its councils, be subject to its influence, perhaps condescend to its desires for peace, and so compromise, in his opinion, the honour of

¹ Clarendon, *Memoirs*, 206

the throne. The queen's opposition was still more decided; an English assembly, whatever its zeal for the royal cause, could not fail to be adverse to the catholics and her favourites. Yet the proposal once known, it was difficult to reject it; the royalist party had received it with transport; even the council forcibly urged its advantages, the subsidies which the new parliament would vote to the king, the discredit into which that at Westminster would fall, when it should be seen how many members had quitted it. Charles, accordingly, despite his own repugnance, assented: and such was the tendency of public feeling, that the intention of dissolving a rebellious parliament, had for its sole effect the formation of a second parliament.¹

The measure at first caused some anxiety in London; it was known that the royalist party were at the same time renewing their attempts in the city; that it was in contemplation to negotiate a treaty of peace directly with the citizens, without the intervention of parliament; that the basis of this treaty was already agreed upon, amongst others the acknowledgment of the loans effected in the city, the interest upon which was very irregularly paid by parliament, and which the king readily offered to guarantee the prompt liquidation of.² Out of London, another plot was also discovered, formed it is said by the moderate party and a few obscure independents, to prevent the entry of the Scots into England, and to shake off the yoke of the presbyterians,³ no matter at what price. The commons, lastly, had to deplore the loss of the oldest and perhaps most useful of their leaders: Pym had just expired (Dec. 8), after a few days' illness—a man of a reputation less brilliant than that of Hampden, but who, both in private deliberations and in public debate, had rendered the party services no less important; firm, patient, and able; skilful in attacking an enemy, in directing a debate or an intrigue, in exciting the anger of the people, and in securing and fixing to his cause the great lords who seemed wavering;⁴ an indefatigable member of almost every committee, the framer of well nigh all the decisive measures of his party, ever ready

¹ Parl. Hist. iii. 104. The royal proclamation convoking the parliament at Oxford, bears date 22nd of December, 1643.

² Ib. iii. 196; Milton, Hist. of England, book iii.

³ Parl. Hist. iii. 200; Whitelocke, 79.

⁴ Clarendon, ii. 693.

to undertake duties which others avoided as difficult and troublesome; in a word, regardless of labour, annoyances, wealth, glory, he placed his whole ambition in the success of his party. A little before his illness, he had published a justification of his conduct, especially addressed to the friends of order and peace, as if he felt some regret for the past, and in secret feared lest he should be blamed for the events of the future.¹ But death spared him, as it had done Hampden, the pain of going beyond his opinions, on the one hand, or belying his past life, on the other; and far from malevolently pointing out these slight indications of doubt in the last days of this veteran of national reform, the men who were preparing to convert reform into revolution, Cromwell, Vane, Haslerig, were the first to show honour to his memory: Pym's body lay for several days in public, either to gratify the wish of the people who crowded to view it, or to contradict the report spread by the royalists, that he died of the pedicular disease; a committee was ordered to inquire into the state of his fortune, and to erect a monument to him in Westminster Abbey; the whole house attended his funeral, and a few days after, undertook the payment of his debts, amounting to 10,000*l.*, all having been contracted, as they said, in the service of his country.²

On the same day that the commons passed these resolutions, a deputation from the city common council proceeded to the house of lords to return thanks to parliament for its energy, and the lord general for his bravery, to renew before it the oath to live and die in its holy cause, and to invite all the members to a grand dinner, in token of union (Jan. 13, 1644).³

The parliament resumed all its confidence. On the very day when the assembly at Oxford was to meet (22 Jan.), there was a call of the house at Westminster; only twenty-two lords sat in the upper house, but in the commons two hundred and eighty members answered to their names, and of the absentees a hundred were engaged in the public service by order of parliament.⁴ Both houses resolved that they would not allow their rights to be put in question,

¹ See Appendix, x.

² Parl. Hist. iii. 180.

³ Ib. 187, 198, Whitelocke, 80.

Parl. Hist. 199; Whitelocke, *ut sup.*

and that they would reject with contempt any correspondence with the rivals who were opposed to them. An opportunity soon presented itself. A week had scarcely elapsed, when Essex transmitted to the upper house, without having opened it, a packet which the earl of Forth, the general-in-chief of the royal army, had just forwarded to him. A committee was appointed to examine its contents; its report was prompt and brief: the packet, it said, contained nothing addressed to parliament, and the lord general had nothing to do but to send it back. Essex at once obeyed (1 Feb.).¹

It was, indeed, to him alone that the despatch was addressed. Forty-five lords, and one hundred and eighteen members of the commons,² assembled at Oxford, informed him of their installation, of their wishes for peace, of the king's favourable disposition, and urged him to employ his influence "to incline also to peace those whose confidence he possessed."³ By these words were designated the houses at Westminster, whom Charles persisted in no longer recognising as a parliament.

On the 18th of February, another letter reached Essex; the earl of Forth requested a safe-conduct for two gentlemen, whom he said the king wished to send to London with instructions relative to peace. "My lord," replied Essex, "when you shall send for a safe-conduct for those gentlemen mentioned in your letter, from his Majesty to the houses of parliament, I shall, with all cheerfulness, show my willingness to further any way that may produce that happiness that all honest men pray for, which is a true understanding between his majesty and his faithful and only council, the parliament."⁴

Charles congratulated himself on finding his adversaries so

¹ Parl. Hist. iii. 201.

² The prince of Wales and the duke of York were at the head of this list, which was afterwards augmented by the names of five lords and twenty-three members of the lower house, who were not at Oxford when the letter was sent. There were reckoned, in addition to these, twenty-two lords absent on the king's service, nine travelling on the continent, two in prison in London, as royalists, and thirty-four members of the commons absent, either on the king's service, or on leave, or from sickness; in all, there were eighty-three lords, and one hundred and sixty-five members of the commons, assembled in parliament at Oxford.—Parl. Hist. iii. 218.

³ Ib. 209.

⁴ Ib. 212.

impracticable, and that his party would thus, at length, be reduced to place all their hope in war. But the assembly at Oxford was not of the same temper with the king; it fully perceived its weakness, it had great doubts as to the legitimacy of its position—so much so, that it had not dared to take the name of parliament—and it regretted in secret that the king, by refusing the name to the houses at Westminster, had placed such an obstacle in the way of peace. It insisted upon his taking, at all events, one step more in the way of conciliation, in his offering some concession calculated to soothe the other party. Charles consented to write to the houses, to propose a negotiation, and he addressed his letter, "To the lords and commons of the parliament assembled at Westminster," but in the letter, he spoke of "the lords and commons of the parliament assembled at Oxford" as their equals, (March 6).¹ A trumpeter, sent by Essex, soon brought back the answer of parliament: it said, "When we consider the expressions in that letter of your majesty we have more sad and despairing thoughts of obtaining peace than ever, because thereby, those persons now assembled at Oxford, who, contrary to their duty, have deserted your parliament, are put into an equal condition with it. And this present parliament, convened according to the known and fundamental laws of the kingdom, the continuance whereof is established by a law consented unto by your majesty, is, in effect, denied even the name of a parliament. And hereupon we think ourselves bound to let you know, that we must in duty, and accordingly are resolved, with our lives and fortunes, to defend and preserve the just rights and full power of this parliament" (March 9).²

The assembly at Oxford lost all hope of conciliation, and thenceforward regarded itself as sitting without any object. It continued, however, to meet till the 16th of April, publishing long and doleful declarations, voting a few taxes and loans,³ addressing bitter reproaches to the Westminster parliament, and passing repeated resolutions expressive of fidelity to the king; but it was throughout timid, inactive, and perplexed with its own weakness, and, to preserve at least some show of dignity, careful to display in presence of the court

¹ Parl. Hist. iii. 213.

² Ib. 214.

³ Ib. 5; Clarendon, ii. 677

its anxious desire for legal order and peace. The king, who had dreaded the superintendence of such councillors, soon found them as troublesome as useless; they themselves were tired of their solemn sittings, without any aim or result. After earnest protestations that he would continue to regulate his conduct by their opinions, Charles pronounced their adjournment (April 16);¹ and scarcely were the doors closed behind them, than he congratulated himself to the queen upon being at last "rid of this mongrel parliament, the haunt of cowardly and seditious motions."²

The campaign, about to open, announced itself under unfavourable auspices. Notwithstanding the inaction of the two principal armies during the winter, war had been carried on in the other parts of the kingdom, with advantage. In the north-west the regiments recalled from Ireland, after six weeks of success, had been beaten and almost entirely cut to pieces by Fairfax, under the walls of Nantwich, in Cheshire, (Jan. 25).³ In the north, the Scots, under the command of the earl of Leven, had commenced their march into England (Jan. 19); lord Newcastle set forward to meet them, but in his absence Fairfax had defeated, at Selby (April 11), a numerous body of royalists;⁴ and to secure the important fortress of York from attack, Newcastle had found himself obliged to shut himself up in it (April 19).⁵ In the east, a new army of fourteen thousand men was forming under the command of lord Manchester and Cromwell, and nearly ready to march wherever the service of parliament might require its presence. In the south, near Alresford in Hampshire, sir William Waller had gained an unexpected victory over sir Ralph Hopton (March 29). A few advantages obtained by prince Rupert, in Nottinghamshire and Lancashire,⁶ did not compensate for such multiplied losses. Want of discipline, and disorder daily increased in the royalist camp; the honest grew sorrowful and disgusted; the others claimed all the

¹ Parl. Hist. iii. 243—247.

² Thus he spoke of them, in a letter addressed to the queen, dated March 13, 1645; Ludlow, 66.

³ Fairfax, 71.

⁴ Ib. 78.

⁵ Rushworth, ii. 3, 620.

⁶ March the 22nd he abandoned the siege of Newark, and in the month of April following, took Papworth, Bolton, and Liverpool, in Lancashire.

licence of war as the reward of courage without virtue the king's authority over his officers, and that of the officers over the soldiers, became day after day less and less. In London, on the contrary, all the measures taken were at once more regular and more energetic than ever. Complaints had often been made that the parliament did not act with promptitude, that none of its deliberations could remain secret, but that the king was immediately informed of them all; under the name of the committee of the two kingdoms, a council composed of seven lords, fourteen members of the commons, and four Scottish commissioners, was invested, as to war, the relations between the two kingdoms, the correspondence with foreign states, &c., with an almost absolute power (Feb. 16).¹ So great was the enthusiasm in some families that they denied themselves one meal a week, to give the value of it to parliament; an ordinance converted this offering into a compulsory tax, for all the inhabitants of London and its environs (March 26).² Excise duties till then unknown were imposed upon wine, cider, beer, tobacco, and many other commodities (May 16, 1643, and July 8, 1644).³ The committee of sequestration redoubled its severity.⁴ At the opening of the campaign, parliament had five armies; those of the Scots, of Essex, and of Fairfax, at the expense of the public exchequer; those of Manchester and Waller, supported by local contributions, collected weekly in certain counties, which were also called upon to find recruits when needed.⁵ These forces amounted to more than fifty thousand men,⁶ of whom the committee of the two kingdoms had the entire disposal.

¹ Parl. Hist. iii. 246.

² Rushworth, ii. 3, 748.

³ Parl. Hist. iii. 114, 276.

⁴ Ib. 174, 257; Rushworth, ii. 3, 760.

⁵ The seven confederate counties of the east, Essex, Suffolk, Norfolk, Hertford, Cambridge, Huntingdon, Lincoln, and Ely, were taxed at 8445*l.* a week, for the maintenance of Manchester's army. The four counties in the south, Hampshire, Sussex, Surrey, and Kent, paid 2638*l.* a week for the maintenance of Waller's army. Essex's army cost the public treasury 20,504*l.* a month; the Scottish army, 31,000*l.* a month. (Rushworth, ii. 3, 621.) I cannot ascertain the exact cost of Fairfax's army; everything shows it was more irregularly paid than the others, and perhaps in part by local contributions, and in part by parliament. Fairfax, *Memoirs, passim*.

⁶ The Scottish army was 21,000 strong; that of Essex 10,500; that of Waller 5100; that of Manchester 14,000; that of Fairfax 5000 to 6000; in all about 56,000. Rushworth, ii. 3, 603, 621, 654; Fairfax, *passim*.

Notwithstanding the presumption which reigned at Oxford, great anxiety was soon manifested there; the court was astonished at no longer receiving from London any exact information, and at the designs of parliament being kept so secret; all the people at Oxford could learn was that it was making great preparations, that power was becoming concentrated in the hands of the boldest leaders, who talked of decisive measures, and, in a word, that everything wore a very sinister aspect for them. All at once a report spread that Essex and Waller were on their march to besiege Oxford. The queen, seven months gone with child, at once declared that she would depart; in vain did a few members of the council venture to point out the ill effect of such a resolution; in vain did Charles himself express a wish that she should change her determination; the very idea of being shut up in a besieged town was, she said, insupportable, and she should die if she were not allowed to retire towards the west, to some place where she might be confined, far from the seat of war, and whence she could embark for France in case of urgent danger. Furious at the suggestion of an objection, she raved, entreated, wept; all at last gave way. Exeter was chosen as the place of her retreat; and towards the end of April she quitted her husband, who never saw her again.¹

The news which had caused her so much terror was well-founded; Essex and Waller were indeed advancing to blockade Oxford. In another direction Fairfax, Manchester, and the Scots, were to meet under the walls of York, and together lay siege to it. The two great royalist cities and the two great royalist armies, the king and lord Newcastle, were thus attacked at once by all the forces of parliament. Such was the simple and daring plan that the committee of the two kingdoms had just adopted.

Towards the end of May, Oxford was almost entirely invested; the king's troops, successfully driven from every post they occupied in the neighbourhood, had been obliged to fall back, some into the town, the rest to a fortified point, the only one open to them outside the walls, north of the city; no help could arrive in time; prince Rupert was in the depths of Lancashire, prince Maurice besieging the port of Lyme, in Dorset-

¹ Clarendon, ii. 704.

shire, lord Hopton at Bristol, occupied in securing that place from the enemy, who had managed to effect a correspondence with some of the principal inhabitants. A reinforcement of eight thousand men of the London militia enabled Essex to complete the blockade. The peril seemed so urgent, that one of the king's most faithful councillors advised him to give himself up to the earl. "It is possible," replied Charles, with indignation, "that I may be found in the hands of the earl of Essex, but it will be dead." A report, meantime, circulated in London, that, not knowing how to escape, the king was forming the resolution, of either coming unexpectedly into the city, or putting himself under the protection of the lord-general. The alarm of the commons was as great as the king's indignation had been. They immediately wrote to Essex, "My lord, there being here a general report of his majesty coming to London, we, by command of the house, desire your lordship to use your best endeavours to find the grounds of it; and if at any time you shall understand that his majesty intends to repair hither, or to your army, that you presently acquaint the houses, and do nothing therein without their advice." Essex comprehended the distrust which lurked beneath these words. He answered: "My lord, how the general report is come of his majesty's coming to London is all unknown to me. I shall not fail, with my best endeavours, to find the grounds of it; but London is the likeliest place to know it, here being no speech of it in this army. As soon as I shall have any notice of his intention of repairing to the parliament or the army, I shall not fail to give notice of it; I cannot conceive there is any ground for it; but however, I believe I shall be the last that shall hear of it."¹

A very different report, and much more certain, next came by surprise upon the parliament and the army; the king had escaped from them. On the 3rd of June, at nine o'clock in the evening, followed by the prince of Wales, and leaving the duke of York and all the court in the place, he had left Oxford, had passed between the two hostile camps, and joining a body of light troops who awaited him north of the town, speedily put himself beyond reach.²

¹ Parl. Hist. iii. 286; the letter of the house to Essex is dated May 15th, 1644, and his answer is of the 17th of May.

² Clarendon, ii. 765; Rushworth, ii. 3, 671

The astonishment was great, and the necessity of an immediate resolution evident. The siege of Oxford was now a matter of no object; the two armies had before them nothing which required their joint efforts; the king, at liberty, would soon become formidable; it was above all important to prevent his rejoining prince Rupert.

Essex assembled a great council of war, and proposed that Waller, less encumbered with heavy artillery and baggage, should pursue the king, while he himself should march towards the west to raise the siege of Lyme, and reduce that part of the country to the power of parliament. Waller opposed this plan; this, he said, was not the destination which the committee of the two kingdoms had assigned the two armies, in the event of their separating; it was upon him the command in the west was to devolve. The council of war concurred with the lord-general; Essex haughtily demanded submission; Waller obeyed, and began his march, but not without having addressed bitter complaints to the committee, of the contempt with which the earl had treated its instructions.¹

Highly indignant, the committee at once brought the matter before the house; and after a debate of which there remains no record, an order was dispatched to Essex to retrace his steps, to go in pursuit of the king, and to leave Waller to advance alone into the west, as he should have done in the first instance.²

The earl had entered upon the campaign in no very agreeable mood; intimidated for awhile by their perils and his victories, his enemies had, during the winter, recommenced assailing him with their suspicions, and creating for him a thousand annoyances. Just before his departure, a popular petition had demanded the reformation of his army, which the commons had received without any manifestation of displeasure;³ that of Waller was always better provided for, and paid with more regularity;⁴ it was evidently against him, and to replace him in case of need, that lord Manchester was forming a fresh army: at London and in his camp, his friends were indignant that from Westminster-hall, men ignorant of warfare should pretend to direct its operations and prescribe how to act.⁵ He answered the

¹ Clarendon, ii. 733.

² Rushworth, ii. 3, 672.

³ Whitelocke, 80

⁴ Rushworth, ii. 3, 683; Holles, 22.

⁵ Whitelocke, 70.

committee: "Your orders are contrary to military discipline and to reason; if I should now return, it would be a great encouragement to the enemy in all places. Your innocent, though suspected servant, Essex;" and continued his march.¹

The amazed committee suspended the quarrel and their anger; Essex's enemies did not feel themselves strong enough to ruin him, nor even to do without him; they contented themselves for the present with inserting, in the answer they sent him, a few words of reprimand for the tone he had assumed;² and he received orders to proceed with the expedition which the preceding message had enjoined him to abandon.³

The news received from Waller's army had much to do with this cautious procedure. After having vainly pursued the king, this favourite of the committee was in his turn menaced with impending danger. As soon as Charles learnt that the two parliamentary generals had separated, and that he should have but one to grapple with, he stopped, wrote to prince Rupert to march without an instant's delay to the succour of York,⁴ and, by a bold resolution retracing the road he had followed in his flight from Oxford, re-entered that city seventeen days after he had quitted it, put himself at the head of his troops, and resumed the offensive, while Waller was seeking him in Worcestershire. At the first report of his movements, Waller returned by forced marches, for he alone was left to cover the road to London; and soon after, having received a few reinforcements, he advanced with his wonted confidence to offer, or, at least, accept battle. Charles and his men, filled with that ardour which unexpected success after great peril inspires, were still more eager. The action took place on the 29th of June, at Cropredy-bridge in Buckinghamshire, and, notwithstanding a brilliant resistance, Waller was beaten, even more completely than the conquerors themselves at first supposed.⁵

Good fortune appeared to give Charles a daring, and even a skill he had not hitherto manifested. At ease with refer-

¹ Rushworth, ii. 3, 683; Clarendon, ii. 733

² Rushworth, *ibid.*

³ Rushworth, *ibid.*

⁴ His letter is dated June 14, 1644, from Tickenhall, near Bewdley, in Worcestershire. It was published for the first time in 1819, in sir John Evelyn's *Memoirs*, ii. 87.*

⁵ Clarendon, ii. 744; Rushworth, ii. 3, 675.

ence to Waller, he at once resolved to march towards the west, to fall with his whole disposable force upon Essex, and thus, in two blows, destroy the two armies which had lately kept him almost a prisoner. Essex, moreover, had appeared under the walls of Exeter, and the queen, who resided there, and who had been confined only a few days,¹ and was as yet ignorant of her husband's success, would again be assailed by all her fears.² Charles departed two days after his victory, having first, to conciliate the people rather than from any sincere wish for peace, sent from Evesham a message to both houses (dated July 4, 1644), in which, without giving them the name of parliament, he was profuse of pacific protestations, and offered once more to open negotiations.³

But just after his departure from Oxford, and before his message reached London, all the fears of parliament were dispelled; the face of affairs had changed; Waller's defeat was now only regarded as an unimportant accident: parliament had just learned that its generals had obtained near York a most brilliant victory, that the town must speedily surrender, that, in a word, in the north the royalist party was all but annihilated.

In fact, on the 2nd of July, at Marston Moor, between seven and ten in the evening, the most decisive battle that had yet taken place, had brought about these great results. Three days before, at the approach of prince Rupert, who was advancing towards York with twenty thousand men, the parliamentary generals had resolved to raise the siege, hoping that they should at least be able to prevent the prince throwing succours into the besieged city; but Rupert defeated their manœuvres, and entered York without a battle. Newcastle strongly urged him to remain satisfied with this success; discord, he said, was working in the camp of the enemy; the Scots were on bad terms with the English, the independents with the presbyterians, lieutenant-general Cromwell with major-general Crawford; if he must fight, let him at least wait for a reinforcement of three thousand men, which would shortly arrive. Rupert scarcely listened to what he said, bluntly replying that he had orders from the

¹ June 16, 1644, of the princess Henrietta, afterwards duchess of Orleans.

² Clarendon, ii. 751; Rushworth, ii. 3, 680.

³ Rushworth, ii. 3, 687.

king,¹ and ordered the troops to march upon the enemy who were retreating. They soon came up with their rear; both parties stopped, called in their outposts, and prepared for battle. Almost within musket-shot of each other, separated only by some ditches, the two armies passed two hours motionless and in profound silence, each waiting for the other to commence the attack. "What office does your highness destine me?" asked lord Newcastle of the prince. "I do not propose to begin the action before to-morrow," replied Rupert, "you can repose till then." Newcastle went and shut himself up in his carriage. He had scarcely sat down, when a volley of musquetry informed him that the battle was beginning; he immediately proceeded to the scene of action, without assuming any command, at the head of a few gentlemen, offended like himself with the prince, and like him acting as volunteers. In a few moments the moor was the scene of utter disorder; the two armies met, dashed into each other's ranks, got mixed up together in mere confusion; parliamentarians and royalists, cavalry and infantry, officers and soldiers, wandered about over the field of battle alone or in bands, asking for orders, seeking their division, fighting when they met an enemy, but all without general design or result. First of all, the right wing of the parliamentarians was routed; next, broken and panic-struck by a vigorous charge of the royalists, the Scottish cavalry dispersed; Fairfax vainly endeavoured to keep them together; they fled in all directions, crying, "Bad luck to us! we are undone!" and they spread the news of their defeat so rapidly through the country, that from Newark a messenger carried it to Oxford, where, for some hours, bonfires were burning to celebrate the supposed triumph. But

¹ These orders were contained in the letter above mentioned, and which directed him to go to the assistance of York. It has been matter of great discussion whether it expressly enjoined prince Rupert to give battle, or whether he was left at liberty to avoid it; a puerile question; for, assuredly, if Rupert had thought with Newcastle, that a battle ought not to be risked, he would have been wrong in obeying orders given at a distance and on mere speculation. Besides, notwithstanding what Mr. Brodie and Mr. Lingard have recently said on this subject, (*Hist. of the British Empire*, iii. 447; *Hist. of England*, x. 252), it is by no means probable that the king's letter contained a positive order: it is evidently written in the conviction that the siege of York could not be raised without a battle, and it is in that sense that it speaks of a victory as indispensable.

on returning from the pursuit, the royalists, to their great surprise, found the ground they had previously occupied in the possession of a victorious enemy; while the Scottish cavalry were flying before them, their right wing, although commanded by Rupert himself, had undergone the same fate; after a violent struggle, they had yielded before the invincible determination of Cromwell and his squadrons; Manchester's infantry completed their defeat; and satisfied with having dispersed the prince's horse, Cromwell, skilful in rallying his men, had returned immediately to the field, to make sure of the victory ere he thought of celebrating it. After a moment's hesitation, the two armies resumed the conflict, and at ten o'clock not a royalist remained on the field, except three thousand slain and sixteen hundred prisoners.¹

Rupert and Newcastle re-entered York in the middle of the night, without speaking to, without seeing one another; as soon as they arrived, they exchanged messages: the prince sent word to the earl: "I have resolved to depart this morning with my horse and as many foot as are left;" "I am going forthwith to the sea-side," replied Newcastle, "to depart for the continent." Each kept his word; Newcastle embarked at Scarborough, Rupert marched towards Chester, with the wreck of his army, and York capitulated in a fortnight (July 16).²

The independent party were in an ecstasy of joy and hope; it was to their chiefs, to their soldiers this brilliant success was due; Cromwell's ability had decided the victory; for the first time the parliamentary squadrons had broken the royalist squadrons, and it was the saints of the cavaliers of Cromwell who had done this. They and their general had, on the very field of battle, received the surname of *Ironsides*. Prince Rupert's own standard, publicly exhibited at Westminster, attested their triumph;³ and they might have sent to parliament more

¹ Rushworth, ii. 3, 631—640; Clarendon, ii. 758; Ludlow, 53; Fairfax, 84, &c.; Hutchinson, *Memoirs* (1808), 205; Carte's *Letters*, i. 56; Baillie's *Letters*, ii. 36, 40.

² Clarendon, ii. 755.

³ In the middle of this standard was a lion couchant, and behind him a mastiff biting at him; from the mastiff's mouth came a streamer, on which was to be read, *Kimbolton*; at its feet were several little dogs, beneath whose jaws was written, *Pym, Pym, Pym*; from the lion's own jaws proceeded these words: *quousque tandem abutere patientiâ nostra?* — Rushworth, ii. 3, 635.

than a hundred flags taken from the enemy, if, in their enthusiasm, they had not torn them in pieces to decorate their helmets and arms.¹ Essex, indeed, had conquered twice, but as if by constraint, to save the parliament from impending destruction, and with no other effect; the saints sought the battle, and were not afraid of victory. Were the Scots, who had shown such cowardice on this great day, thenceforth to pretend to subject them to their presbyterian tyranny? Would peace be any longer spoken of as necessary? Victory and liberty alone were necessary; it was essential to achieve these, at whatever price, and carry out to its full extent that blessed reform so often endangered by interested or timid men, so often saved by the arm of the Lord. Everywhere was this language heard; everywhere did independents, freethinkers, or fanatics, citizens, preachers or soldiers, give emphatic utterance to their excitement and their wishes; and everywhere was heard the name of Cromwell, himself beyond all others vehement in his expressions, while, at the same time, he passed for the most skilful in the contrivance of deep designs. "My lord," said he one day to Manchester, in whom the party still reposed confidence, "be wholly one of us; talk no more of holding ourselves open to peace, of keeping on terms with the lords, of fearing the refusal of parliament; what have we to do with peace and the lords? Nothing will go on right till you call yourself plain Mr Montague; if you bind yourself to honest folk, you will soon be at the head of an army that will give laws to king and parliament too."²

With all the audacity of his hopes, Cromwell himself had no idea how near the triumph of his party was, nor how hard a fate was shortly to befall that adversary whom he most dreaded.

Essex had advanced further and further into the west, encouraged by easy victories, and ignorant of the dangers gathering behind him. In three weeks he had raised the siege of Lyme, taken Weymouth, Barnstaple, Tiverton, Taunton, and dispersed, almost without a blow, the royalist troops who attempted to stop him. As he approached Exeter, the queen sent to request a safe-conduct to go to

¹ Rushworth, ii. 3, 635.

² Holles, *Memoirs*, 18; Clarendon, ii. 841.

Bath or Bristol, for the purpose of regaining her strength after her confinement. "If your majesty," he replied, "pleases, I will not only give you a safe-conduct, but will wait upon you myself, to London, where you may have the best advice and means for restoring your health; but as for either of the other places, I cannot obey your majesty's desire without directions from the parliament."¹ Seized with fear, the queen fled to Falmouth, where she embarked for France (July 14), and Essex continued his march. He was still in sight of Exeter when he heard that the king, having defeated Waller, was rapidly advancing against him, collecting on the way all the forces he could command. A council of war being immediately called, it was put to the question whether they should go on and entrench themselves in Cornwall, or return, seek the king, and offer him battle. Essex was of the latter opinion, but several of the officers, among others lord Roberts, the friend of sir Harry Vane, possessed in Cornwall large estates, of which the rents were long in arrear, and they had relied upon this expedition to obtain payment from their tenants; they therefore opposed any idea of going back, maintaining that the people of Cornwall, oppressed by the royalists, would rise at the approach of the army, and that Essex would thus have the honour to dispossess the king of this county, hitherto his firmest support.² Essex allowed himself to be persuaded, and, having sent to London for reinforcements, entered the defiles of Cornwall. The people did not rise in his favour, provisions were scarce, and the king was already close upon him. He wrote again to London, to say that his situation was becoming perilous, that it was essential for Waller or some one else, by making a diversion on the rear of the king's army, to give him an opportunity of escape. The committee of the two kingdoms made a great clamour about his misfortune, and seemed filled with vast zeal to aid him; public prayers were directed (Aug. 13);³ orders to meet his wishes were given to Waller, Middleton, even to Manchester, who had returned from the north with a portion of his army; these in their turn manifested the utmost ardour: "Let money and men be

¹ Rushworth, ii. 3, 684; Whitelocke, 93.

² Clarendon, ii. 767; Rushworth, ii. 3, 690.

³ Rushworth, ii. 3, 697.

sent to me," wrote Waller, "God is witness, 'tis not my fault I do not advance more quickly; may infamy and the blood that is spilt rest on the heads of those who lay obstructions in my way. If money cannot be had, I will march without it." But he did not march. Middleton held the same language, put himself in motion, and stopped at the first obstacle. No corps at all was detached from Manchester's army.¹ Reassured by the victory of Marston Moor, the independent leaders, Vane, St. John, Ireton, Cromwell, were delighted to purchase by a signal check the ruin of their enemy.

They did not imagine that at that very moment, and in his utter distress, Essex held, perhaps, their fate in his hands. On the 6th of August, a letter from the king was delivered to him at his head-quarters at Lestwithiel, full of expressions of esteem and promises, urging him to give peace to his country. Lord Beauchamp, the earl's nephew, was the bearer of the message; several colonels in his army seemed favourable to it.² "I shall give no answer," said Essex. "I have only one advice to give the king; it is, to return to his parliament." Charles did not persist; perhaps even, notwithstanding the disaster at Marston Moor, he did not altogether desire the intervention of such a mediator; but peace, in those about him, had more earnest partisans; the spirit of independence and examination gained upon the royalists; the royal name no longer exercised its former empire over them, and in their meetings many officers freely discussed public affairs and the king's conduct. Persuaded that Essex had only rejected the proposed negotiation because the king's promises seemed to him without adequate guarantee, they resolved to offer him their own, and to invite him to an interview with them. Lord Wilmot and lord Percy, commanders of the cavalry and artillery, were at the head of this design; the one daring, intellectual, an inveterate drinker, and beloved by the army for the jovial affability of his temper; the other cold and haughty, but bold in speech, and keeping a good table, which

¹ Ludlow, *Memoirs*, 55; Whiteſocke, 101.

² Among others, colonel Weare and colonel Butler; Rushworth, ii. 3, 710

many of the officers shared. Informed of their proceedings, and of a letter which was circulating in their name, Charles was exceedingly angry; but the intention pleased even those men who blamed the means. The king, not daring to forbid, made up his mind to approve of it; the letter became an official act, authorized by him and signed by prince Maurice and the earl of Brentford, general-in-chief of the army, as well as by its first authors; a trumpeter conveyed it to the enemy's camp (Aug. 9). "My lords," replied Essex, "in the beginning of your letter you express by what authority you send it; I having no authority from the parliament, who have employed me, to treat, cannot give way to it without breach of trust. My lords, I am your humble servant, Essex." So dry a refusal greatly piqued the royalists; all idea of negotiation was abandoned; Wilmot and Percy were deprived of their commands, and hostilities took their course.¹

Essex soon found himself in a desperate position; he fought every day, but only to fall every day into greater danger; his soldiers were getting weary of the contest, conspiracies were forming in their ranks;² the king drew his lines closer and closer around him, and erected redoubts on every side; already the earl's cavalry had not space enough to collect forage; there scarcely remained to him any free communication with the sea, the only means by which he could obtain provisions: in short, at the latter end of August, he was surrounded so closely that from the neighbouring heights the royalists could see all that passed in his camp. In this extremity, he gave orders to the cavalry, commanded by sir William Balfour, to make their way, as they might, through the enemy's posts, and set out himself with the infantry for Fowey harbour. Favoured by night and a fog, the cavalry succeeded in passing between two royalist divisions; but the infantry, straggling along narrow and miry roads, pursued by the whole of the king's army, compelled to abandon at every step cannon and baggage, at last lost all hope of safety; there was a general desire expressed to capitulate. Dejected, perplexed, anxious

¹ Rushworth, ii. 3, 691—697; Clarendon, ii. 777.

² Rushworth, ii. 3, 698,

to avoid so deep a humiliation, Essex, without consulting any one, attended only by two officers,¹ suddenly quitted the camp, gained the coast, and embarked in a vessel which set sail for Plymouth, leaving his army under the command of major-general Skippon.²

As soon as his departure was known, Skippon called a council of war: "Gentlemen," said he, "you see our general and some chief officers have thought fit to leave us, and our horse are got away; we are left alone upon our defence. That which I propound to you is this, that we having the same courage as our horse had, and the same God to assist us, may make the same trial of our fortunes, and endeavour to make our way through our enemies, as they have done, and account it better to die with honour and faithfulness, than to live dishonourable." But Skippon did not communicate his own heroism to the council: many officers, brave and faithful soldiers, but presbyterians, moderate men like Essex, were, like him, sorrowful and dispirited. The king proposed to him a capitulation on unhoped-for terms; he only required the surrender of the artillery, ammunition and arms; all the troops, officers, and soldiers were to retain their liberty, and were even to be conducted in safety to the next parliamentary quarters. These conditions were accepted (Sept. 1); and, under the escort of some royalist horse, the parliamentarian battalions traversed, without a general, without arms, the counties which they had just marched through as conquerors.³

Meantime, Essex landed at Plymouth, and sent an account to parliament of his disaster. "It is the greatest blow," he wrote, "that ever befel our party; I desire nothing more than to come to the trial; such losses as these must not be smothered up."⁴ A week after, he received from London this reply:—

"My lord, the committee of both kingdoms having acquainted the houses of parliament with your lordship's letter from Plymouth, they have commanded us to let you know

¹ Sir John Merriek, who commanded the artillery, and lord Roberts himself, who had induced Essex to enter Cornwall.

² Rushworth, ii. 3, 705; Clarendon, ii. 787; Whitelocke, 98.

³ Rushworth, ii. 3, 704—709; Clarendon, *ut sup.*

⁴ Essex's letter to sir Philip Stapleton, in Rushworth, ii. 3, 703

that as they apprehend the misfortune of that accident, and submit to God's pleasure therein, so their good affections to your lordship, and their opinion of your fidelity and merit in the public service is not at all lessened. And they are resolved not to be wanting in their best endeavours for repairing of this loss, and drawing together such a strength under your¹ command as may, with the blessing of God, restore our affairs to a better condition than they are now in, for which purpose they have written to the earl of Manchester to march with all possible speed towards Dorchester, with all the forces he can of horse and foot. Sir William Waller is likewise ordered to march speedily unto Dorchester, with all his horse and foot. The houses have appointed six thousand foot-arms, five hundred pairs of pistols, and six thousand suits of clothes, shirts, &c., to meet your lordship at Portsmouth, for the arming and encouragement of your forces. And they are confident your lordship's presence in these parts for bringing the forces together into a body, and disposing of them, will very much conduce to the public advantage."

The surprise of the earl was extreme; he expected impeachment, or at least bitter reproaches; but his fidelity, so recently proved, the very extent of the disaster, the necessity of producing an effect on the enemy, induced the wavering to rally round his partisans on this occasion, and his adversaries had resolved to abstain from attacking him. Essex, embarrassed by his misfortune and his fault, no longer seemed to them dangerous; they knew him well, and foresaw that ere long, to save his dignity such violent shocks as these, he would withdraw from public life. Till then, by treating him with honour, they obtained credit for themselves; they escaped an inquiry, which they might have found disagreeable, into the real causes of his defeat; and, lastly, the favourers of peace would now be necessitated to make a new effort for war. Skilful as earnest, the independent leaders remained silent, and the parliament appeared unanimous in sustaining this great reverse with dignity.

Its activity and the firmness of its attitude at first slackened the king's movements; he addressed a pacific message

¹ In Rushworth, (ii. 3, 708,) we read: "under their command," but in the Parliamentary History the text is, "under your command," and I have adopted this as by far the most probable. The letter is dated Sept. 7, 1644.

to the houses, and for three weeks contented himself with appearing before a few places, Plymouth, Lyme, Portsmouth, which did not surrender. But towards the end of September he learnt that Montrose, who had long since promised him civil war in Scotland, had at last succeeded, and was already obtaining one triumph after another. After the battle of Marston Moor, disguised as a servant and followed only by two companions, Montrose had crossed on foot the borders of Scotland, and proceeded to Strathern, the house of his cousin, Patrick Graham of Inchbrachie, at the entrance into the Highlands, to await there the landing of the Irish auxiliaries whom Antrim was to send him. By day he hid himself; at night he traversed the surrounding mountains, collecting in person, from place, to place information from his adherents. The news soon reached him that the Irish troops had landed (July 8), and were advancing into the country, pillaging and ravaging, but not knowing whither to proceed, and seeking the general who had been promised them. They were on the confines of Athol, when Montrose, with a single attendant, suddenly appeared in their camp, dressed as a Highlander. They at once acknowledged him their chief. At the news of his arrival several clans joined him; without losing a moment, he led them to battle, requiring everything from their courage, giving up everything to their licentious rapacity; and in a fortnight he had gained two battles (at Tippermuir, Sept. 1, and at Dee bridge, Sept. 12), occupied Perth, taken Aberdeen by storm, raised most of the northern clans, and spread fear to the very gates of Edinburgh.

On hearing this news, Charles flattered himself that the disaster of Marston Moor was repaired, that parliament would soon find in the north a powerful adversary, and that he himself might without fear proceed to follow up his successes in the south. He resolved to march upon London, and to give his expedition a popular and decisive appearance, at the moment of his departure, a proclamation, sent forth in every direction, invited all his subjects of the south and east to rise in arms, choose officers for themselves, and joining him on his way, march with him to summon the parliament at length to accept peace.¹

¹ The proclamation is dated from Chard, September 30th, 1644; Rushworth, ii. 3, 715.

But parliament had taken its measures: already the combined troops of Manchester, Waller, and Essex covered London on the west; never had parliament possessed, upon one point, so great an army; and at the first report of the king's approach, it was augmented by five regiments of the London militia, under the command of Sir James Harrington. At the same time, new taxes were imposed; the commons ordered that the king's plate, till then preserved in the Tower, should be melted down for the public service. When at last it was known that the two armies were in presence of each other, the shops were closed, the people rushed to the churches, and a solemn fast was ordained, to conciliate the blessing of the Lord on the coming battle.¹

In the camp as in the city, it was daily expected: Essex alone, ill, despondent, remained inactive in London, though invested with the command of the army. Informed of his non-departure, parliament charged a joint committee to wait on him and renew the assurance of its trusting affection. Essex thanked the committee, but did not join his army.² The battle was fought without him, on the 27th of October, at Newbury, almost on the same ground on which, the year before, on his return from Gloucester, he had so gloriously conquered. Lord Manchester commanded in his absence. The action was long and desperate; Essex's soldiers in particular performed prodigies; at the sight of the cannon, they had recently lost in Cornwall, they rushed fiercely on the royal batteries, recovered their artillery, and brought it back to their own lines, embracing the guns in the transport of their joy. On the other hand, some of Manchester's regiments suffered a severe check. For awhile, both parties claimed the victory; but, next morning, the king, renouncing his project against London, commenced his retreat, and proceeded to Oxford to take up his winter quarters.³

Meantime parliament said very little about its triumph; no public thanks were offered up, and the day after the news of the battle reached London, the monthly fast observed by both houses took place as usual (Nov. 30, 1644), as if there were

¹ Rushworth, ii. 3, 719—720; Parl. Hist., iii. 294, 295, 308.

² Whitelocke, 108; Parl. Hist., iii. 295.

³ Whitelocke, 109; Clarendon, ii. 827; Parl. Hist., iii. 296; Rushworth, ii. 3, 721—730.

no subject for rejoicing. The public were astonished at so much coldness. Disagreeable rumours began to circulate; the victory, it was said, might have been far more decisive; but discord reigned among the generals; they had suffered the king to retreat without impediment, almost in the very face of the army, in a bright moonlight, when the least movement might have prevented it. It was much worse when the news came that the king had just reappeared in the neighbourhood of Newbury, that he had, without interruption, removed his artillery from Donnington castle (Nov. 9)¹, and even offered to renew the battle, without the parliamentary army quitting its inaction. The clamour became general; the house of commons ordered an inquiry; Cromwell only waited for this opportunity to break out: "It is to the earl of Manchester," he said, "all the blame is to be imputed; ever since the battle of Marston Moor, he is afraid to conquer, afraid of a great and decisive success; but now, when the king was last near Newbury, nothing would have been more easy than entirely to destroy his army; I went to the general, I showed him evidently how this could be done, I desired his leave to make the attack with my own brigade; other officers urged this with me, but he obstinately refused; saying only, that if we were entirely to overthrow the king's army, the king would still be king, and always have another army to keep up the war; while we, if we were beaten, should no longer be anything but rebels and traitors, executed and forfeited by the law." These last words greatly moved parliament, which could not endure that any one should suggest a doubt as to the legality of its resistance. Next day, in the upper house, Manchester answered this attack, explained his conduct, his words, and in his turn accused Cromwell of insubordination, of falsehood, nay, of treachery; for on the day of the battle, he said, neither he nor his regiment appeared at the post assigned to them. Cromwell did not reply to this charge, but only renewed his own accusations more violently than before.²

The presbyterians were greatly excited; for a long time past, Cromwell had given rise to much alarm in their minds.

¹ Rushworth, ii. 3, 720—732; Clarendon, *ut sup.*

² Rushworth, ii. 3, 732—736; Parl. Hist. iii. 297; Ludlow, 63; Clarendon, ii. 840; Holles, Memoirs 10.

They had seen him at first supple and fawning with Manchester, exalting him on all occasions at the expense of Essex, and acquiring, by degrees, over his army more power than he himself had. He had made it the refuge of the independents, of sectaries of every class, enemies of the covenant as of the king; under his protection a fanatical licence reigned there; each man talked, prayed, and even preached according to his own fancy and his own will. In vain, to countervail Cromwell's influence, had they appointed colonel Skeldon Crawford, a Scotchman and rigid presbyterian, major-general; all that Crawford had done, as yet, was to make an absurd charge of cowardice against Cromwell, while Cromwell, constantly occupied in detecting his adversary's faults, in depreciating him in the opinion of the soldiers, in denouncing him to parliament and to the people, soon rendered him incapable of doing any harm.¹ Emboldened by this success, and by the visible progress of his party, he had openly declared himself the protector of liberty of conscience, and had even obtained from parliament, with the aid of the freethinkers and philosophers, the formation of a committee (Sept. 13)² charged to inquire how best they might satisfy the dissenters, or at least leave them in peace. Now he attacked Manchester himself, never mentioned the Scots but with insult, spoke largely of triumphing without them, and even of driving them out of England, if they attempted to oppress it in their turn; in a word, carried his daring so far, as to bring into question the throne itself, the lords, the whole ancient and legal order of the country.³ Alarmed and indignant, the leaders of the presbyterian and moderate political parties, and the Scottish commissioners, Holles, Stapleton, Merrick, Glynn, &c., met at Essex's house to devise means for defeating so dangerous an enemy. After a long conference, they resolved to consult Whitelocke and Maynard, both eminent lawyers and both highly respected by the house, and whom they had reason to believe favourable to their cause. They were sent for in the name of the lord-general, nearly in the middle of the night, without their being told for what purpose. They arrived somewhat alarmed at the hour

¹ Bullie's Letters, ii. 40. ² Ib. 57; Journals, Commons, Sept. 13.

³ Whitelocke, 116; Journals, Lords, Nov. 28, 1644; Clarendon, *et sup.*

and the circumstances. After a few compliments: "Gentlemen," said lord Lowden, the Scottish chancellor, "you know very well that lieutenant-general Cromwell is no friend of ours, and since the advance of our army into England, he hath used all underhand and cunning means to take off from our honour and merit of this kingdom; he is also no well-willer to his excellency, whom you and we all have cause to love and honour; you know very well the accord betwixt the two kingdoms, and the union by the solemn league and covenant, and if any be an incendiary between the two nations, how is he to be proceeded against? By our law in Scotland, we call him an incendiary who kindleth coals of contention and causeth differences in the state, to the public damage, and he is *tamquam publicus hostis patriæ*. Whether your law be the same or not, and whether lieutenant-general Cromwell be not such an incendiary as is meant by our term, and in which way would be best to take to proceed against him, if he be such an incendiary, you know best."

The two lawyers looked at each other; all were waiting for their answer. After a few moments' silence, Whitelocke rose, and said: "I see none of this honourable company is pleased to discourse further on these points, and I shall therefore, with submission to his excellency, declare humbly and freely my opinion upon those particulars which have been so clearly proposed and opened by my lord chancellor. The sense of the word 'incendiary' is the same with us as his lordship hath expressed it to be by the law of Scotland; whether lieutenant-general Cromwell is such an incendiary cannot be known but by proofs of his particular words or actions, tending to the kindling of this fire of contention betwixt the two nations, and raising of differences between us. I take for a ground that my lord-general and my lords the commissioners of Scotland, being persons of so great honour and authority as you are, must not appear in any business, especially of an accusation, but such as you shall see before, and will be clearly made out, and be brought to the effect intended. I take lieutenant-general Cromwell to be a gentleman of quick and subtle parts, and who hath, especially of late, gained no small interest in the house of commons, nor is he wanting of friends in the house of peers, nor of abilities in himself to manage his own part or defence to the best ad-

antage. I have not yet heard any particulars mentioned by his excellency, nor by my lord-chancellor or any other, nor do I know any in my private observations, which will amount to a clear proof of such matters as will satisfy the house of commons that lieutenant-general Cromwell is an incendiary, and to be punished accordingly. I apprehend it to be doubtful, and therefore cannot advise that at this time he should be accused for an incendiary; but rather that direction may be given to collect such particular passages relating to him, and that this being done, we may again wait on your excellency, if you please, and upon view of those proofs we shall be the better able to advise and your lordships to judge what will be fit to be done in this matter."

Maynard concurred with Whitelocke, adding, that the word "incendiary" was little used in English law, and would give rise to great uncertainty. Holles, Stapleton, and Merrick, strongly urged their views, saying, that Cromwell had not so much influence in the house, that they would readily take it upon themselves to accuse him, and they mentioned facts and words which they said clearly proved his designs. But the Scottish commissioners refused to engage in the struggle. Towards two in the morning, Maynard and Whitelocke retired, and the conference had no other result than to excite Cromwell to quicken his steps; for "some false brother," says Whitelocke, probably Whitelocke himself, "informed him of what had passed."¹

Essex and his friends sought another sort of remedy for the evil which threatened them; all their thoughts were directed towards peace. The subject had never been wholly withdrawn from the consideration of parliament: on one occasion a formal motion had produced a debate and a division favourable to peace, in which very few votes, that, indeed, of the speaker alone, decided the fate of the country (March 29);² and once again, the ambassadors of France and Holland, who were continually going backwards and forwards between London and Oxford and Oxford and London, offered their mediation,

¹ Whitelocke, 117; Wood, *Athenæ Oxoniensis*, ii. 546.

² On the motion to appoint a committee to examine the offer of mediation made by the ambassador of Holland, the house of commons divided, sixty-four to sixty-four; the speaker gave a casting vote in the negative; *Parl. Hist.* ii. 253.

rarely sincere, and always eluded, though with some embarrassment, on both sides.¹ So many persons desired peace, that no one would have dared to show himself openly opposed to it; and for the last six months, a committee of members of both houses, and of Scotch commissioners, had been engaged in framing proposals on the subject.

All at once the presbyterian party pressed forward the work; in a few days the proposals were presented to both houses, debated, and adopted (Nov. 2),² and on the 20th of November nine commissioners departed to carry them to the king. They thought he was at Wallingford, and presented themselves before that place; after waiting two hours, while their mission, their safe conduct, their retinue, were successively made the subjects of quibbling discussion, the governor, colonel Blake, at last received them, to tell them that the king was gone, and that they would probably find him at Oxford. They wished to sleep at Wallingford, but the conversation between Blake and lord Denbigh, president of the committee, soon became so warm, Blake's language so rude, and the attitude of his garrison so menacing, that they judged it prudent to retire without delay. The next day, on arriving near Oxford, they stopped on a little hill at a short distance from the city, and announced themselves to the governor by a trumpeter. Some hours passed, and no answer was returned. The king, walking in his garden, perceived on the hill the group formed by the commissioners and their suite, inquired who those people were, and on being informed, immediately sent Mr. Killigrew with orders to introduce them into the city, provide lodgings for them, and express his regret they should have been kept waiting so long. As they passed through the streets of Oxford, under the escort of a few cavaliers, the populace collected together, loaded them with abuse, and even pelted them with stones and mud. Taken to a miserable inn, they had scarcely established themselves, when a violent tumult arose near their apartment; Holles

¹ The ambassadors of Holland offered the mediation of the states-general on the 20th of March, the 12th of July, and the 7th of November, 1644; the count d'Harcourt, ambassador of France, who arrived in London in July, 1644, had an audience with parliament on the 14th of August, and left England in February, 1645; *Parl. Hist.* iii. 252, 253, 278, 285, 293, 298, 314; *Clarendon*, ii. 602.

² *Parl. Hist.* iii. 299.

and Whitelocke immediately went out; some royalist officers had entered the great room, and were quarrelling with the commissioners' people, calling them and their masters "wretches," "traitors," "rebels," and not suffering them to come near the fire. Holles seized one of the officers by the collar, and roughly shaking him, pushed him out of the room, reproaching him for his conduct: Whitelocke did the same; the doors of the inn were closed, and the governor placed a guard there. In the evening several members of the council, Hyde among others, came to see the commissioners, apologized for the disturbance which had taken place, manifested an extreme desire to co-operate with them in obtaining peace, and the king sent word that he would receive them next day (Nov. 2).¹

The audience was brief: lord Denbigh read the proposals of parliament aloud, in presence of the council and the court: they were such as the king did not think himself reduced to accept; they required him to surrender his power to the distrust of parliament, his party to its vengeance. More than once a murmur of anger broke forth from among those present; at one time particularly, when lord Denbigh named prince Rupert and prince Maurice, who were standing by, as excluded from any amnesty, a roar of laughter was on the lips of the courtiers; but the king, turning round with a severe look, imposed silence on all, and continued to listen patiently and gravely. The reading over: "Have you power to treat?" asked he of lord Denbigh. "No, sir; we had in charge to bring these propositions to you, and desire your answer in writing." "Well," replied the king, "I will give it you as soon as I can;" and the commissioners returned to their inn.²

The same evening, with the consent of their colleagues, Holles and Whitelocke paid a visit to lord Lindsey, a gentleman of the chamber, and an old friend, whose wounds had prevented him from coming to them. They had scarcely been with him a quarter of an hour when the king came in, and advancing towards them with an air of kindness, said, "I am sorry, gentlemen, that you can bring me no better propositions for peace, nor more reasonable than these are." "Sir,"

¹ Whitelocke, 112; Parl. Hist. iii. 310.

² Parl. Hist. iii. 310.

replied Holles, "they are such as the parliament thought fit to agree on, and I hope a good issue may be had out of them." The king: "I know you could bring no other than what they would send, but I confess I do not a little wonder at some of them, particularly at the qualifications; surely you yourselves cannot think them to be reasonable or honourable for me to grant." Holles: "Truly, sir, I could have wished that some of them had been otherwise than they are, but your majesty knows that these things are all carried by the major vote." The king: "I know they are, and am confident you who are here and your friends (I must not say your party) in the house, endeavoured to have had them otherwise; for I know you are well-willers to peace." Whitelocke: "I have had the honour to attend your majesty often here before upon this errand, and am sorry it was not to better effect." The king: "I wish, Mr. Whitelocke, that others had been of your judgment and Mr. Holles's judgment, and then, I believe, we had a happy end to our differences before now; for my part, I do earnestly desire peace; and in order to it, and out of the confidence I have of you two that are here with me, I ask your opinion and advice what answer will be best for me to give at this time to your proposition, which may probably further such a peace as all good men desire." Holles: "Your majesty will pardon us if we are not capable, in our present condition, to advise your majesty." Whitelocke: "We now by accident have the honour to be in your majesty's presence; but our present employment disables us from advising your majesty, if we were otherwise worthy, in this particular." The king: "For your abilities I am able to judge, and I now look not on you in your employments from the parliament, but as friends and my private subjects, I require your advice." Holles: "To speak in a private capacity, your majesty sees that we have been very free; and touching your answer, I shall say further, that I think the best answer would be your own coming amongst us." The king: "How can I come thither with safety?" Holles: "I am confident there would be no danger to your person to come away directly to your parliament." The king: "That may be a question; but I suppose your principals who sent you hither will expect a present answer to your message." Whitelocke: "The best present and most satisfactory answer, I humbly

believe, would be your majesty's presence with your parliament." The king: "Let us pass by that; and let me desire you two, Mr. Holles and Mr. Whitelocke, to go into the next room, and a little confer together, and to set down somewhat in writing, which you apprehend may be fit for me to return as an answer to your message, and that, in your judgment, may facilitate and promote this good work of peace." Holles: "We shall obey your majesty's command."

They both went into another room; and, after some hesitation, Whitelocke, carefully disguising his handwriting, drew up the opinion the king had requested of them; then, leaving the paper on the table, they rejoined his majesty. The king went by himself into the room they had quitted, took the paper, came back with it, and then, after some conversation, very gracious on his part, withdrew. The commissioners directly returned to their inn, and maintained, with their colleagues, a profound silence as to what had passed.¹

Three days after (Nov. 27),¹ the king sent for the committee, and, delivering to lord Denbigh a sealed paper, without superscription, said: "This is my answer; take it to those who sent you." Surprised at this unusual form, and at finding the king so obstinate in refusing to give the name of parliament to the houses at Westminster, the earl begged leave to retire for a moment with his colleagues to deliberate on what they should do. "Why should you deliberate?" said the king; "you have no power to treat; you told me so yourself when you arrived, and I know you have had no post since." Lord Denbigh insisted, alleging that the committee might perhaps have some observations to offer to his majesty. "Gentlemen," said the king, warmly, "I will hear anything you have to deliver from London, but none of the fancies and chimeras taken up at Oxford; by your favour, you shall put no tricks on me." "Sir," replied the earl, "we are not persons to put tricks upon any one, much less upon your majesty." "I mean it not to you." "Will your majesty at least allow us to inquire to whom this paper is addressed?" "It is my answer; you must take it, if it were a ballad, or a song of Robin Hood." "The business which

¹ Whitelocke. 113; Holles, *Memoirs*, 38.

brought us here, sire, is of somewhat more importance than a ballad." "I know it; but I repeat, you told me you had no power to treat; my memory is as good as yours; you were only charged to deliver these proposals to me; an honest postillion would have done as well." "I hope your majesty does not take us for postillions." "I do not say that; but, once more, this is my answer; you must take it; I am not bound to anything more." The conversation became warmer every moment. Holles and Pierpoint endeavoured in vain to get the king to say, that he addressed his message to the two chambers. The commissioners at last agreed to receive it in its existing form, and quitted the presence. In the evening, Mr. Ashburnham, the king's valet-de-chambre, came to them. "His majesty," he said, "is sensible some words may have fallen from him in his passion that might give discontent; it was not so intended by him, and he desires the best construction may be put upon it." The commissioners made protestations of their respectful deference to the king's words, and set out for London, accompanied by a trumpeter, authorized to receive the answer of parliament to the sealed paper of which they were the bearers.¹

It only contained the request of a safe-conduct for the duke of Richmond and the earl of Southampton, by whom the king promised to send, in a few days, an express and detailed answer. The safe-conduct was at once granted; and immediately upon their arrival (Dec. 14), the two lords had an audience (Dec. 16). Even they did not bring any answer; their official mission was limited to a request that conferences should be opened, and negotiators named on both sides to treat of peace. But after delivering this message, they remained in London; the report spread that a crowd of suspected persons were arriving; several members of the two houses had frequent interviews with the two lords. The common council, in which the independents prevailed, manifested great uneasiness. The two lords were requested to

¹ Rushworth, ii. 3, 843; Parl. Hist., iii. 300—312; Whitelocke, 114. Lord Denbigh's report and Whitelock's narrative, though both eye-witnesses, present several important points of difference here, but they may be explained by the official character of the first of these documents, evidently arranged among the commissioners, so that it would suit parliament and the occasion. Parl. Hist., iii. 309

depart; they still lingered under frivolous pretexts. The agitation increased; the passions of the people threatened to break out before party intrigues could be accomplished. At last, urged even by the friends of peace, the two lords returned to Oxford (Dec. 24), and three weeks after their departure, it was agreed that forty commissioners, twenty-three from the parliaments of the two kingdoms, and seventeen from the king, should meet at Uxbridge, to discuss regularly the conditions of a treaty.¹

But while the presbyterians were negotiating peace, the independents were preparing war. On the 9th of December, the commons had assembled to take into consideration the sufferings of the kingdom, and to devise some remedy for them. No one rose to speak; all seemed expecting some decisive measure, of which every one wished to avoid the responsibility. After a long silence, Cromwell addressed the house: "Now is the time to speak, or for ever hold the tongue. The important occasion is no less than to save a nation, out of the bleeding, nay almost dying condition, the long continuance of the war hath already reduced it to. If we do not prosecute this war in a more speedy, vigorous, and effectual manner, casting off all lingering proceedings, like soldiers of fortune beyond sea, to spin out a war, we shall make the kingdom weary of us, and hate the name of a parliament. For what do the enemy say, nay, what do many say that were friends at the beginning of the parliament? Even this, that the members of both houses have got great places and commands, and the sword into their hands, and what by interest in parliament, and what by power in the army, will perpetually continue themselves in grandeur, and not permit the war speedily to end, lest their own power should determine with it. This I speak here to our own faces is but what others do utter abroad behind our backs. I am far from reflecting on any; I know the worth of those commanders, members of both houses, who are yet in power; but if I may speak my conscience, without reflection on any, I do conceive, if the army be not put into another method, and the war more vigorously prosecuted, the people can bear

¹ Rushworth, ii. 3, 844—846; Parl. Hist., iii. 310—320; Clarendon, ii. 860.

the war no longer, and will enforce you to a dishonourable peace. But this I would recommend to your prudence, not to insist upon any complaint or oversight of any commander-in-chief upon any occasion whatsoever; for as I must acknowledge myself guilty of oversights, so I know they can rarely be avoided in military affairs; therefore, waiving a strict inquiry into the causes of these things, let us apply ourselves to the remedy which is most necessary; and I hope we have each true English hearts and zealous affections towards the general weal of our mother country, so as no members of either house will scruple to deny themselves of their own private interests for the public good; nor account it to be a dishonour done to them, whatever the parliament shall resolve upon in this weighty matter."

Another member went on: "whatever is the matter, two summers are passed over, and we are not saved. Our victories (the price of blood invaluable) so gallantly gotten, and, which is more, so graciously bestowed, seem to have been put into a bag with holes; for what we win at one time, we lose at another. A summer's victory has proved but a winter's story: the game has shut up with autumn, to be new played again next spring, as if the blood that has been shed were only to manure the field of war, for a more plentiful crop of contention. I determine nothing; but this I would say, it is apparent that the forces being under several great commanders, want of good correspondency amongst the chieftains, has oftentimes hindered the public service." "There is but one means of ending so many evils," said Zouch Tate, an obscure fanatic, and whom the importance of his proposal did not draw from his obscurity; "which is that every one of us should freely renounce himself. I move, that no member of either house shall during this war, enjoy or execute any office or command, civil or military, and that an ordinance be brought in accordingly."¹

This proposal was not absolutely new; already, the year before (Dec. 12, 1643), a similar idea had been expressed, in the upper house, though casually and without result;² and recently (Nov. 14, 1644), the commons, doubtless to appease public clamour,

* Rushworth, i. 4, 3—5; Parl. Hist. iii. 320; Clarendon, ii. 848: whose account is evidently inexact.

² Parl. Hist. iii. 187.

had ordered an inquiry¹ into the number and value of the offices of all kinds held by members of parliament. Either by design or from embarrassment, the presbyterians hesitated at first to oppose Tate's motion, and it passed almost without objection. But two days after, when it was again brought forward in the form of a distinct resolution, the debate was long and violent, and was renewed four times in the course of a week (Dec. 11, 14, 17, 19). It was clear that it was intended to take from the moderate politicians, from the presbyterians, from the first leaders of the revolution, the executive power, to confine them to Westminster Hall, and to form an army independent of parliament. The opposition was renewed at each sitting; every time with more warmth. Even some who were in the habit of keeping fair with the independents, spoke against the measure. "You know," said Whitelocke, "that among the Greeks and Romans the greatest offices, both of war and peace, were conferred upon their senators: and their reasons were, because they, having greater interests than others, were the more capable to do them the greatest service. And having the same interest with the senate, and present at their debates, they understood their business the better, and were less apt to break that trust which so nearly concerned their private interests, which were involved with the public. I humbly submit the application to your judgment; your ancestors did this; they thought the members of parliament fittest to be employed in the greatest offices; I hope you will be of the same judgment, and not at this time pass this ordinance, and thereby discourage your faithful servants."²

Others went still further, and openly denounced the secret ambition of their rivals. "You talk of self-renouncing," said they; "it will be only the triumph of envy and self-ends."³ But the public had little faith in these predictions; the presbyterian party was worn out and in discredit; all who did not belong to it, saw it fall without regret. Though the independents were far from being in a majority in the house, their proposition passed triumphantly through all its stages: in vain, as a last endeavour, did the friends of

¹ Journals, Commons.

² Whitelocke, 120.

³ Ib.

Essex require that he should be excepted from the prohibition, their amendment was rejected; and, on the 21st of December, the ordinance was definitively adopted,¹ and transmitted to the house of lords.

The presbyterians rested all their hopes in that house; the peers had an imperative interest in rejecting the bill; almost all of them were affected by it; by it they would lose every vestige of power. But then, herein, as regarded public opinion, was precisely a source of discredit and weakness. To diminish the effect of this, to free themselves from all suspicion of connivance with the court at Oxford, to discourage the royalist plots, always ready to break out; above all, to gratify the passions of the presbyterian party, the leaders of that party, while they sought to check the progress of revolution, offered it concessions and victims. Four prosecutions, begun long ago, but which had been left in abeyance, were resumed and energetically pushed forward; that of lord Macguire, for taking part in the Irish rebellion; of the two Hothams, father and son, for having agreed to surrender Hull to the king; of Sir Alexander Carew for a similar offence in the isle of St. Nicholas, of which he was governor; finally, of Laud, already more than once begun, laid aside, and resumed. Macguire, the Hothams, and Carew, were guilty of recent crimes, legally proved, and which might have imitators; but Laud, four years a prisoner, aged, infirm, had only to answer for his co-operation in a tyranny, now four years since put an end to. As in the trial of Strafford, it was impossible to prove high treason against him by law. To condemn him, like Strafford, by a bill of attainder, the king's consent was necessary; but theological hatred is as subtle as implacable. At the head of the prosecution was that same Prynne whom Laud had formerly caused to be so odiously mutilated, and who was now eager in his turn to humiliate and crush his enemy. After a long trial, in which the archbishop showed more talent and prudence than might have been expected, a simple ordinance of parliament, voted by seven lords only, and illegal, even according to the traditions of parliamentary tyranny, pronounced his condemnation. He died with pious courage, full of contempt for his adversaries.

¹ Dec. 17, by 100 to 93.

and of fear for the future fate of the king.¹ The other trials had the same result; and in six weeks, the scaffold was erected five times on Tower-hill,² oftener than had occurred since the commencement of the revolution.³ The measures of general government were directed in the same spirit. A week before Laud's execution (Jan. 3), the liturgy of the Anglican church, hitherto tolerated, was definitively abolished; and on the proposal of the assembly of divines, a book entitled 'Directions for Public Worship' received in its stead the sanction of parliament.⁴ The party leaders were quite aware that this innovation would meet with great opposition, and cared little for its success; but to retain the power about to escape them, they needed all the support of the fanatical presbyterians, and refused them nothing. The independents, on their side, used every effort to get the upper house to adopt the decisive ordinance; petitions recommenced, some of them even threatening, demanding that the lords and commons should sit together in one assembly.⁵ A solemn fast was ordained (Dec. 18), in order to call down, upon so grave a deliberation, some light from the Lord; the two houses only were present at the sermons preached that day in Westminster, doubtless to leave the preachers a fuller career, and Vane and Cromwell had taken care to select their men.⁶ At last, after repeated messages and conferences, the commons went in a body to the upper house to demand the adoption of the ordinance (Jan. 13)⁷, but the lords had taken their resolution, and on the very day of this marked step, the ordinance was rejected.

¹ According to the Journals of the House of Lords, twenty peers sat on the day on which Laud was condemned; but probably several went out before the vote was taken; for it is shown, by unquestionable documents, that the majority who condemned him consisted only of the earls of Kent, Pembroke, Salisbury, Bolingbroke, and the lords North, Grey of Wark, and Bruce (Somers' Tracts, ii. 287). Lord Bruce afterwards denied that he had voted.

² Sir Alexander Carew was executed Dec. 23, 1644; John Hotham, the younger, Jan. 1, 1645; Sir John Hotham, Jan. 2; Laud, Jan. 10; and lord Mauguire, Feb. 20.

³ State Trials, iv. 315, &c.; Parl. Hist. iii. 315, 320, 322.

⁴ Neal, Hist. of the Puritans, iii. 127.

⁵ Rushworth, i. 4, 5; Lingard, Hist. of England, x. 282.

⁶ Clarendon, ii. 845; Whitlocke, 119.

⁷ Parl. Hist. iii. 333—337; Rushworth, i. 4, 7; Whitlocke, 123.

The victory seemed great and the moment propitious for making use of it. The negotiations at Uxbridge were drawing near. On the urgent entreaties of the fugitive members who had obscurely opened at Oxford their second session, Charles had at last consented (towards the end of December, 1644) to give the name of parliament to the houses at Westminster: "If there had been in the council," he wrote to the queen, "but two persons of my mind, I would never have given way."¹ He had at the same time named his commissioners,² who were nearly all friends of peace; and among the parliament commissioners,³ Vane, St. John, and Prideaux, alone entertained other views. On the 29th of January the negotiators arrived at Uxbridge, full of good intentions and hope.

They met with mutual earnestness and courtesy. They had all long known each other; many, before these sad dissensions, had been united by ties of friendship. On the very evening of their arrival, Hyde, Colepepper, Palmer, Whitelocke, Holles, Pierpoint, exchanged visits, congratulating each other on working together to procure peace for the country. More embarrassment and reserve, however, was observable in the commissioners from Westminster, who bore the yoke of rougher and more mistrustful masters. The negotiations were to last twenty days; the subjects for especial consideration were religion, the militia, and Ireland. It was agreed that each of these questions should be discussed for three days, taken as might be arranged, consecutively or alternately. So long as these preliminaries were the only business in hand, everything went on very smoothly; there was

¹ Memoirs of Ludlow.

² The duke of Richmond, the marquis of Hertford, the earls of Southampton, Kingston, and Chichester; the lords Capel, Seymour, Hatton, and Colepepper; the secretary of state Nicholas, sir Edward Hyde, sir Edward Lane, sir Orlando Bridgeman, sir Thomas Gardiner, Mr. John Ashburnham, Mr. Geoffrey Palmer, Dr. Stewart, and their suite, in all one hundred and eight persons.

³ The earls of Northumberland, Pembroke, Salisbury, and Denbigh; lord Wenman, Messrs. Denzil Holles, William Pierpoint, Oliver St. John, Whitelocke, John Carew, Edmund Prideaux, and sir Harry Vane, for the English parliament; the earl of Lowden, the marquis of Argyle, the lords Maidland and Balmerino, sir Archibald Johnston, sir Charles Erskine, sir John Smith, Messrs. George Dundas, Hugh Kennedy, Robert Berkley, and Alexander Henderson, for the Scottish parliament, with their suite; in all, one hundred and eight persons.

entire confidence on both sides, perfect politeness. But when, at length, the real discussion began (Jan. 30), around the table at which the negotiators were seated, all the difficulties reappeared. Each of the parliamentary factions had its fundamental point, of which it would not bate a jot; the presbyterians, the privileged establishment of their church; the politicians, the command of the militia; the independents, liberty of conscience; and the king, obliged to concede to all, only obtained from each such sacrifices as the others absolutely refused. Each party, moreover, kept constantly in view the question whether, peace being concluded, power would be in its hands, for neither would treat except on this condition. The subject of religion being taken first, the discussion soon assumed the character of a theological controversy; they argued, instead of negotiating; they were more anxious to make out a case than to make peace. By degrees, acrimony pervaded the intercourse late so amicable; it even made its way into those private conversations in which some of the negotiators at times sought to remove the obstacles which impeded their public discussions. Among the commissioners from Oxford, Hyde, more especially, was courted by those of Westminster, who knew him to be a man of superior judgment, and in great credit with the king. Lord Lowden, chancellor of Scotland, and the earls of Pembroke and Denbigh, had long and frank interviews with him on the dangers of the future, on the sinister designs which were fermenting in parliament, on the necessity that the king should give up a great deal to save the whole. Hyde readily entered into these communications; but the susceptibility of his self-love, the unbending haughtiness of his intellect, his dry and sarcastic tone, his scornful honesty, nearly always offended and repelled those who sought his society. The least incident revealed all these perplexities, all the futility of the peaceful wishes of the negotiators. On a market day, in the church of Uxbridge, a man of the name of Love, a fanatic preacher from London, inveighed, in the presence of a large congregation, against the royalists and the treaty, with the most outrageous virulence. "No good can come of it," said he; "those people are here from Oxford with hearts full of blood; they only want to amuse the people till they can do them some notable injury; this treaty is as far

from peace as heaven from hell." The king's commissioners required that the man should be punished for his insolence, but the parliamentarians dared do no more than send him from Uxbridge.¹ Unfavourable reports circulated as to the king's real intentions; it was said that though he had yielded so far to the wishes of his council he had no wish for peace, had promised the queen to conclude nothing without her consent, and was far more intent upon fomenting the internal dissensions of parliament, than on coming to a genuine understanding with it. He was even suspected of being secretly in treaty with the papists of Ireland to raise an army among them; and the most solemn protestations of his commissioners did not succeed in dispelling the distrust of the city on this subject.

Meanwhile the assigned period for terminating the negotiations approached, and the parliament showed very little inclination to prolong them. Desperate at seeing the negotiators about to separate without result, the friends of peace, towards the middle of February, concerted a final effort. It seemed to them that some concession on the part of the king with reference to the militia, the offer, for instance, of giving up the command of it for some years to leaders, half of whom should be named by parliament, would not be without its effect. Lord Southampton proceeded in all haste to Oxford to obtain this concession from the king. Charles at first refused; the earl entreated; other noblemen joined him, on their knees, in supplicating the king, for the sake of his crown and his people, not to reject this chance of favourable negotiation. Charles at last yielded; and the desire for peace was so fervent in the minds of his councillors, that in their joy at this success, all difficulties seemed well nigh at an end. Fairfax and Cromwell were among those to whom the king was himself to propose that the command of the militia should be entrusted. At supper, gaiety reigned round the royal table. The king complained that his wine was not good; "I hope," said one of the company, laughingly, "that, in a few days, your majesty will drink better at Guildhall with the lord mayor." Next morning, lord Southampton, about to return to Uxbridge, waited on the king to receive, in writing, the

¹ Clarendon, ii. 267; Rushworth, ii. 3, 848; Whitelocke, 127.

instructions agreed upon; but, to his extreme astonishment, Charles withdrew his promise, and definitively refused the concession.¹

A letter from Montrose, received during the night from the other end of Scotland, with a rapidity almost unexampled, had induced this sudden change. A fortnight before, at Inverlochy, in Argyleshire, Montrose had gained a brilliant victory over the Scottish troops commanded by Argyle himself (Feb. 2).² After giving an account of it to the king, he went on to express his utter aversion to all treaties with the rebel parliament in England. "Greatly," he wrote—"greatly as the success of your majesty's arms in Scotland had exhilarated my heart, this news from England has more than counterbalanced that joy. The last time I had the honour of seeing your majesty, I fully explained to you what I know so well to be the designs of your rebellious subjects in both kingdoms; and your majesty may, perhaps, remember how much you were then convinced that I was in the right. I am sure that since then nothing can have happened which can have changed your majesty's opinion on the subject. The more you grant, the more will be demanded of you; and I have but too many reasons to be certain that they will not be content till they have rendered your majesty a mere king of straw. Pardon me, then, august and sacred sovereign, if I venture to say that, in my humble opinion, it is unworthy of a king to treat with rebel subjects while they retain the sword in hand. God forbid that I should seek to repress the mercy of your majesty! but I shudder with horror when I think of a treaty being in hand while your majesty and those people are in the field, with two armies. Permit me, in all humility, to assure your majesty that, with the blessing of God, I am in the right way to make this kingdom submit again to your power; and if the measures I have concerted with your other faithful subjects do not fail, which is hardly to be supposed, before the end of this summer, I shall be in a position to come to the assistance of your majesty, with a gallant army; and, sustained by the justice of your cause, you will inflict on these rebels, in England and in Scotland, the just chastisement of

¹ Wellwood's *Memoirs* (1718), 62; Banks, *A Critical Review of the Life of Oliver Cromwell* (1769), 108.

² Whitelocke, 133

their rebellion. When I have submitted this kingdom to your power, and have conquered from Dan to Beer-sheba, as I doubt not I shall very quickly, I hope I may have then to say, as David's general said to his master: '*Come thou, lest this country be called by my name;*' for in all my actions I have nothing in view but the glory and interest of your majesty."¹ This letter had restored to the king his utmost hopes; though less confident, lord Southampton did not insist; and he brought the refusal to Uxbridge, without explaining the cause of it. The conferences were broken off, and the presbyterian chiefs returned to Westminster, almost broken-hearted at a discomfiture, which threw them back once more into all the dangers of their situation.²

In their absence, that situation had grown still more perilous. Compelled to abandon, for awhile at least, the self-denying ordinance, the independents had directed their most ardent efforts to the measure which was to accompany it, the re-organization of the army. In a few days, everything had been prepared, concerted, settled; the plan, the form, the expense, the means of providing for it.³ Only one army was for the future to be kept on foot, composed of twenty-one thousand men, and commanded by one general, who was even to be invested with the right of naming all the officers, subject to the approbation of parliament. This general was Fairfax. For a long time past, his distinguished valour, the frankness of his character, the success of his expeditions, the warlike enthusiasm with which his presence inspired the troops, had fixed public attention upon him; and Cromwell had answered, publicly in the house, privately to his party for the fitness of this choice. Essex retained his rank, Waller and Manchester their commissions, but without even a shadow of power. On the 28th of January, the ordinance which was to regulate the execution of this measure was sent to the lords. They endeavoured at least to retard its adoption, by proposing various amendments, and protracting the debate on each. But in this instance resistance was difficult, for the ordinance had the sanction of the people, who were convinced that the multi-

¹ Wellwood, *ut sup.*

² Whitelocke, 134.

³ The new army was to cost 50,135*l.* a month; to be raised in nineteen counties; Rushworth, i. 4, 8—13

plicity of armies and their chiefs was the true cause of the prolongation and inefficacy of the war. Strong in this support, the commons urged the measure forward; the lords at last yielded (Feb. 15); and on the 19th of February, two days before the rupture of the negotiations at Uxbridge, Fairfax, introduced into the house, received with a simple and modest air, standing by the chair which had been prepared for him, the official compliments of the speaker.¹

On their return to Westminster, the presbyterian leaders endeavoured to redeem this defeat. The upper house complained bitterly of the injurious and even threatening language which had been lately used in reference to them, and of the report everywhere in circulation that the commons meditated the abolition of the peerage. The commons answered by a solemn declaration of their profound respect for the rights of the lords and their firm resolution to uphold them (March 24).² The Scottish commissioners addressed to both houses (March 3), in the name of the covenant, a remonstrance at once sharp and timid.³ The commons, without noticing it, transmitted to the lords another ordinance, still further enlarging Fairfax's powers, and striking out from his commission the injunction hitherto repeated in all similar documents, "to watch over the safety of the king's person." The lords voted that it should be restored; the commons refused (March 29): "this phrase," they said, "would dishearten their soldiers, and encourage the king to adventure his person to come at the head of his army into any danger." The lords insisted, and in three successive debates, notwithstanding the active efforts of the commons, the votes were equally divided in the upper house on this question.⁴ Everything remained in suspense: the commons declared that, for their part, having now done everything in their power, if the delay caused any misfortune, the lords alone must answer for it to the country (March 31).⁵ The latter began to grow weary of a resistance of which they foresaw not only the futility, but the approaching end. While this was going on, the marquis of Argyle arrived from Scotland: a presbyterian in religion, he inclined in politics to the bolder class of thinkers; and the independents, Vane and

¹ Whitelocke, 181; Parl. Hist. iii. 340; Rushworth, i. 3, 7; Holles, 34.

² Parl. Hist. iii. 348. ³ Ib. 346. ⁴ Ib. 350. ⁵ Ib.

Cromwell in particular, soon contracted an intimacy with him. Argyle, besides, had recent injuries to avenge: a man of supple and profound intellect, with great activity of mind, but firmer in the council than in the field, he had gone no nearer the battle, in which the Scots were defeated at Inverlochy by Montrose, than the middle of the lake, and had taken to flight the instant he saw his soldiers disperse.¹ From that day, both in England and in Scotland, the cavaliers never mentioned his name without insult, and their complete fall could alone satisfy his vengeance. He employed his influence to dissuade the Scottish commissioners and some of the presbyterian leaders from further opposition, not only to the reorganization of the army, but to the self-denying ordinance itself; an opposition, he said, from which everything suffered, and which sooner or later the necessity of the case must inevitably overcome.² Essex saw the resolution of his friends daily more and more wavering. Determined to anticipate their weakness, he announced that he would resign his commission; and on the 1st of April, rising in his place in the upper house, with a paper in his hand, to which he constantly referred, for he was altogether unskilled in the art of speaking, he said: "My lords, having received this great charge in obedience to the commands of both houses, and taken their sword into my hand, I can with confidence say that I have for these now almost three years, faithfully served you, and I hope, without loss of honour to myself or prejudice to the public. I see, by the now coming up of these ordinances, that it is the desire of the house of commons that my commission may be vacated; and it hath been no particular respect to myself (whatever is whispered to the contrary) that hath made me thus long omit to declare my readiness thereto, it being not unknown to divers men of honour, that I had resolved it after the action of Gloucester, but that some importunities (pressed on me with arguments of public advantage, and that by those of unquestionable affection) overruled me therein. I now do it, and return my commission into those hands that gave it me; wishing it may prove as good an expedient to the present distempers, as some will have it believed. I think it not im-

¹ Malcolm Laing, *Hist. of Scotland, &c.*, iii. 294.

² Clarendon, ii. 910.

modest, that I entreat both houses that those officers of mine which are now laid by, might have their debentures audited, some considerable part of their arrears paid them for their support, and the remainder secured them by the public faith. My lords, I know that jealousies cannot be avoided in the unhappy condition of our present affairs, yet wisdom and charity should put such restraint thereto, as not to allow it to become destructive. I hope that this advice from me is not unseasonable, wishing myself and friends may, among others, participate the benefit thereof; this proceeding from my affection to the parliament, the prosperity whereof I shall ever wish from my heart, what return soever it bring myself—I being no single example, in that kind, of that fortune I now undergo.”¹

This speech seemed to the upper house quite a providential deliverance. They hastened to inform the commons that they adopted the ordinance for the reorganization of the army, without amendment (April 3). At the same time, the earls of Denbigh and Manchester also gave in their resignation. The house voted them, for this patriotic sacrifice, thanks and promises, which the commons fully sanctioned. The next day, a self-denying ordinance, somewhat differing from the first, but tending to just the same results, passed without obstacle in the upper house;² and men congratulated themselves on seeing at last terminated a contest which had caused them so much anxiety.

¹ Parl. Hist. iii. 352.

² Parl. Hist. iii. 353—355. See the self-denying ordinance, in the Parliamentary History, iii. 355.

BOOK THE SIXTH.

1645—1646.

Formation of the army of the independents—Cromwell retains his command—Campaign of 1645—Alarms of parliament—Battle of Naseby—The parliament seizes and publishes the king's private correspondence—Decline of the royalist party in the west—Flight and anxiety of the king—Montrose's victory in Scotland—The king attempts to join him, but without success—Defeat of Montrose—The king's stay at Newark—He returns to Oxford and seeks to renew negotiations with the parliament—The parliament rejects the overture—New elections—The king treats with the insurgent Irish—The treaty discovered—Defeat of the last royalist troops—The king escapes from Oxford and seeks refuge in the Scottish camp.

No sooner had Essex and Manchester given in their resignation, than Fairfax quitted London (April 3), and fixing his head-quarters at Windsor, set himself assiduously to work to form, out of their two armies, the new force he was to command. It had been predicted that this process would meet with violent resistance; and Cromwell, to whom, as well as to Essex and Manchester, the self-denying ordinance extended, had repelled all such fears, protesting, that as far as he was concerned, "his soldiers had been taught to march or remain, to fight or to lay down their arms, according to the commands of parliament." Some seditions, however, broke out, particularly at Reading, where there were five regiments of Essex's infantry, and in Hertfordshire, where eight squadrons of his cavalry were quartered, under the command of colonel Dalbier. The presence of Skippon, who had been named major-general of the new army, and his rough but effective eloquence, sufficed to appease the regiments at Reading (April 6). Those of Dalbier were not so

readily tranquillized; it was even reported in London that they were about to join the king at Oxford; and St. John, ever violent and disposed to severity, wrote to the leaders in Hertfordshire, to fall suddenly, and sword in hand, on the factious. But through the influence of some of the cashiered officers and of Essex himself, Dalbier at last submitted, and proceeded to head-quarters. In truth, the discontent among the soldiers was of no very marked character, and they resigned themselves without difficulty to their new leaders. The parliament gave them a fortnight's pay, and ordered that the confiscated estates of some of the delinquents should be sold to satisfy the most pressing demands. Cromwell's soldiers also mutinied, notwithstanding his guarantee to the contrary, declaring they would serve under no other leader; and Cromwell alone had power enough over them to make them return to their duty. At the first intimation of their insubordination, he set off to render, as he said, this last service to parliament before he quitted his command. Towards the 20th of April, the work was almost accomplished; all the new corps were organized without difficulty; in London alone, the excitement was prolonged by the crowds of cashiered officers who all flocked thither, either to solicit the payment of their arrears, or to watch the progress of events.¹

At Oxford the king and court were full of hope. After the rupture of the negotiations at Uxbridge, and notwithstanding the brilliant news from Scotland, Charles had felt some uneasiness. Though by no means eager for peace, it was his interest that the pacific party should predominate at Westminster, and their defeat alarmed him for the moment. He resolved to separate from his son Charles, prince of Wales, who was now approaching his fifteenth year, and to send him, with the title of generalissimo, into the western counties, both to give to those faithful districts a chief capable still of animating their devotion, and to divide the perils which might threaten royalty. Hyde and lords Capel and Colepepper, were ordered to accompany the prince and direct everything in his name. Such was, at this period, the despondency of the king's thoughts, that he conversed several times with Hyde on what would happen if he himself were

¹ Holles, *Memoirs*, 31, *et passim*; Rushworth, i. 4, 17.

to fall into the hands of the rebels, and indirectly sounded him, by means of lord Digby, as to whether in case of need and without orders, and even contrary to ostensible orders, he would decide to take the prince out of England, and convey him to the continent. "Such questions," answered Hyde, "cannot be resolved until the time of need;" and on the 4th of March the prince and his councillors took leave of the king, whom they never saw again.¹ But a month after, when it was known at Oxford what obstacles impeded the reorganization of the parliamentary army, when the regiments were seen in insurrection, and the most illustrious officers put aside, confidence and gaiety reappeared among the cavaliers. Soon they only spoke with derision of this mob of peasants and preaching mechanics, idiots enough to drive from them generals whose names and ability had constituted their sole strength, and to raise to the command officers as obscure, as utter novices as their soldiers. Songs, jests, puns, were daily sent forth against the parliament and its defenders; and the king, in spite of his grave temperament, allowed himself to be persuaded by these convenient arguments. He had, besides, secret hopes, arising from intrigues of which even his most intimate confidants were ignorant.

Towards the end of April, Fairfax announced that in a few days he should open the campaign. Cromwell went to Windsor, to kiss, as he said, the general's hand, and take him his resignation. On seeing him enter the room, Fairfax said, "I have just received from the committee of the two kingdoms an order which has reference to you; it directs you to proceed directly with some horse, to the road between Oxford and Worcester, to intercept communications between prince Rupert and the king."² The same evening Cromwell departed on his mission, and in five days, before any other corps of the new army had put itself in motion, he had beaten the royalists in three encounters (April 24, at Islip-bridge; 26, at Witney; 27, at Bampton Bush), taken Bletchington (April 24), and sent to the house a full report of his success.³ "Who will bring me this Cromwell, dead or

¹ Clarendon, Mem. i. 230.

² Sprigg, *Anglia Rediviva* (London, 1647), 10; Rushworth, i. 4, 23.

³ Parl. Hist. iii. 359; Rushworth, i. 4, 24.

alive!"¹ cried the king; while in London all were rejoicing that he had not yet given in his resignation.

A week had scarcely passed, and the parliament had already made up its mind that he should not resign. The campaign had commenced (April 30.) The king, quitting Oxford (May 7), had rejoined prince Rupert, and was proceeding towards the north, either to raise the siege of Chester, or to give battle to the Scottish army, and regain on that side his former advantages; if he succeeded, he would be in a position to threaten, as he pleased, the east or the south; and Fairfax, then on his way to the west, to deliver the important town of Taunton, closely invested by the prince of Wales, could not oppose his progress. Fairfax was recalled (May 5); but, meantime, Cromwell alone was in a condition to watch the king's movements. Notwithstanding the ordinance, he received orders to continue his service forty days (May 10.)² Sir William Brereton, sir Thomas Middleton, and sir John Price, distinguished officers, and members of the commons, received similar orders,³ either from similar motives, or that Cromwell might not seem the only exception. *

Fairfax hastened his return; the king had continued his march towards the north; in London, without its being altogether known why, the alarm was somewhat appeased; no royalist army any longer covered Oxford, the focus of war in the centre of the kingdom; the parliament believed it had assured friends in the place; Fairfax received orders to invest it (May 17.)⁴ If he took it, it would be an immense success; if the siege was prolonged, he could proceed thence without obstacle, to any point which the king might threaten. Cromwell joined him before Oxford.

They had scarcely met when alarm once more spread throughout London, more intense than ever. Every day unfavourable news came from the north; the Scottish army, instead of marching to meet the king and give him battle, had fallen back towards the border; from necessity, according to some, in order to be in a position to oppose the growing progress of Montrose in that kingdom; from ill humour, according to others, because parliament had refused to submit

¹ Bank's *Critical Review*, &c., 23. ² *Parl. Hist.* iii. 361; Whitelocke, 145.

³ Whitelocke, 146.

⁴ The siege began on the 22nd; Rushworth, i. 4, 33; *Parl. Hist.* iii. 364; *Journals, Lords.*

to the yoke of presbyterians and strangers.¹ However this may have been, favoured by their retreat, the king had only to approach the walls of Chester to raise the siege; and, easy as to this place, his medium of communication with Ireland, he directed his march towards the confederate counties of the east, hitherto the bulwark of parliament. At all hazards, it was essential to secure them from this invasion. No one could effect this object so well as Cromwell, for in that quarter, more especially, his influence prevailed; there had commenced his military levies, his military triumphs. He received orders to move directly upon Cambridge, and take in hand the defence of the confederation.²

A more pressing danger soon occasioned his recal. A week after his departure came the news that the king had taken the rich town of Leicester by storm (June 1, 1645), and that, in the west, Taunton, of late relieved by a detachment of Fairfax's army, was again closely besieged.³ Utter consternation prevailed; the presbyterians triumphed: "There," said they, "is the fruit of your boasted re-organization! since it has been effected, what has been seen? Vague speculation and defeats. The king takes one of our best places in a day, while your general remains motionless before Oxford, doubtless waiting for the women of the court to get frightened, and open the gates to him."⁴ The only answer to this was a petition from the common council, presented to the upper house,⁵ on the 5th of June, in which all the mischief was attributed to the inactivity of the Scots, to the delays which still impeded the recruiting of the army, to the pretension kept up by parliament to regulate at a distance the operations of the war; the petitioners demanded that more discretion should be given to the general, a more decisive intimation to the Scots, to Cromwell his former command. At the same time, Fairfax received orders (June 5) to leave the siege of Oxford, to go in search of the king, and fight at any rate. Before he set out he sent to parliament an application, signed by himself and sixteen colonels, for Cromwell to join him, an officer, he said, indispensably needed to command the cavalry.⁶

¹ Old Parl. Hist. xiii. 474—488.

² Rushworth, i. 4, 35; May, A Breviary of the History of the Parliament (1655), 126; Holles, 35.

³ Whitelocke, 149.

⁴ Clarendon, ii. 980.

⁵ Parl. Hist. iii. 365.

⁶ Parl. Hist. iii. 368.

The lords deferred their answer, but the authorization of the commons was prompt, and accepted as sufficient. Fairfax immediately sent word to Cromwell (June 11);¹ all the regiments hastened their march; and on the 12th of June, a little to the west of Northampton, some of the parliamentary cavalry, sent to reconnoitre, unexpectedly came upon a detachment of the king's army.

He was far from expecting their approach; informed of the blockade of Oxford, and yielding to the fears of the besieged court, who entreated him to return,² he had given up his expedition into the northern and eastern counties, and marched to relieve his head-quarters. But his confidence was not shaken; on the contrary, another victory by Montrose had just still more highly elated his spirits.³ "Never since the beginning of the rebellion," he wrote to the queen, "have my affairs been in so good a position" (June 9).⁴ He accordingly continued his march leisurely, stopping in such places as pleased his eye, spending whole days in hunting, and permitting to his cavaliers, who were still more confident than he, as much liberty as himself.⁵ On the first intimation of the near approach of the parliamentary army, he fell back towards Leicester, to rally his troops, and await those which were to reach him shortly from Wales or from the western counties. The next day (June 13), at supper time, his confidence was still unimpaired, and he had no thought of giving battle.⁶ But he was informed that some of the parliamentary squadrons were harassing his rear-guard. Cromwell had been with the army for several hours.⁷ A council of war was immediately called; and towards midnight, notwithstanding the opposition of several officers, who entreated that the reinforcements should be waited for, prince Rupert caused it to be decided that they should instantly turn and advance upon the enemy.

The meeting took place the next morning (June 14). at

¹ Rushworth, i. 4, 39.

² Memoirs of James II.

³ Gained at Auldearn, in the county of Nairn, in the north of Scotland, the 4th of May, 1645.

⁴ Ludlow, Mem.

⁵ Rushworth, i. 4, 40; Clarendon, ii. 985.

⁶ Evelyn, Memoirs, ii. App. 97, in a letter from the king to the secretary of state, Nicholas, dated the 13th of June.

⁷ Rushworth, i. 4, 41; May, Breviary, 127.

Naseby, to the north-west of Northampton. At dawn of day the king's army formed on a slight eminence, in an advantageous position. The scouts, sent to reconnoitre the parliamentary army, returned in two hours, and reported that they saw nothing of it. Rupert, losing patience, went himself on the look-out, with a few squadrons; it was agreed that the army should remain stationary till he returned. He had scarcely gone a mile and a half before the advanced guard of the enemy appeared, in full march towards the cavaliers. In his excitement, the prince imagined they were retreating, and pushed on, sending word to the king to come and join him with all speed, lest the enemy should escape. Towards ten o'clock the royalist army came up, somewhat disordered by the precipitation of their advance; and Rupert, at the head of the right wing of the cavalry, immediately dashed down upon the left wing of the parliamentarians, commanded by Ireton, who soon after became Cromwell's son-in-law (Jan 15, 1647). Nearly at the same moment, Cromwell, whose squadrons occupied the right wing, attacked the left wing of the king, composed of the cavaliers of the northern counties, under the command of sir Marmaduke Langdale; and immediately after, the two bodies of infantry, posted in the centre—the one under Fairfax and Skippon, the other commanded by the king in person, also came to action. No battle as yet had been so rapidly general or so fiercely contested. The two armies were nearly of equal strength; the royalists, intoxicated with insolent confidence, sent forth as their war-cry *Queen Mary*; the parliamentarians, firm in their faith, marched forward singing, *God is with us!* Prince Rupert made his first attack with his accustomed success; after a warm conflict, Ireton's squadrons were broken; Ireton himself, wounded in the shoulder, and his thigh pierced by a pike, fell for awhile into the hands of the cavaliers. But while Rupert, always carried away by the same fault, pursued the enemy up to the baggage, well defended by artillery, and lost time in attacking that post in the hope of booty, Cromwell, on his side, master of himself and of his men as at Marston Moor, drove in Langdale's squadrons, and leaving two of his officers to prevent their rallying, hastened back to the field of battle, where the infantry were engaged. The conflict was here more violent and deadly than anywhere

else. The parliamentarians, charged by the king in person, had been at first thrown into great disorder; Skippon was severely wounded; Fairfax urged him to retire; "No," said he, "as long as one man will stand, I won't stir," and he ordered his reserve to advance. A blow from a sword beat off Fairfax's helmet; Charles Doyley, the colonel of his guards, seeing him ride about the field bareheaded, offered him his. "It is well enough, Charles," said Fairfax, and refused it. Then pointing out to him a division of the royal infantry, which had as yet resisted every assault, "Can't those people be got at," said he; "have you charged them?"—"Twice, general, but I could not break them."—"Well, take them in front, I will take them in the rear, and we will meet in the middle;" and they did, indeed, meet in the midst of the dispersed ranks. Fairfax killed with his own hand the ensign, and delivered the colours into the hands of one of his men; the latter boasted of this as an exploit of his own: Doyley, who overheard the man, grew angry: "I have honour enough," said Fairfax, who happened to pass at the time; "let him take that to himself." The royalists were, in their turn, giving way in every direction when Cromwell returned with his victorious squadrons. Desperate at this sight, Charles put himself at the head of his regiment of life-guards, the only one he had left in reserve, to attack this new enemy. The order was already given and the troops in motion, when the earl of Carnewarth, a Scotchman, who was galloping by the side of the king, suddenly caught hold of his bridle, and exclaiming, with an oath, "Do you want to get killed?" turned him suddenly to the right. The cavaliers who were nearest the king turned also, without understanding why; the others followed, and in an instant the whole regiment had their backs to the enemy. The surprise of the army became terror; all dispersed over the plain, some to escape, others to stay the fugitives. Charles, amidst a group of officers, in vain cried—"Stop! stop!" The dispersion went on unchecked, till prince Rupert returned to the field of battle with his squadrons. A numerous body then formed round the king, but disordered, weary, perplexed, despondent. Charles, sword in hand, his eyes glaring, despair in every feature, twice dashed forward, vehemently exclaiming, "Gentlemen, one charge more, and we recover the day." But no one followed him; the infantry,

broken in every direction, were in full flight, or already prisoners; retreat was the only course left open; and the king, with about two thousand horse, galloped off in the direction of Leicester, leaving his artillery, ammunition, baggage, more than one hundred flags, his own standard, five thousand men, and all his cabinet papers in the possession of parliament.¹

This victory surpassed the most daring hopes. Fairfax hastened to inform the parliament of it in a calm, simple tone, without any political allusion or advice. Cromwell wrote also, but only to the commons, as holding his commission from them alone; his letter concluded with these words: "This is none other but the hand of God, and to him alone belongs the glory, wherein none are to share with him. The general served you with all faithfulness and honour; and the best commendations I can give him is, that I dare say he attributes all to God, and would rather perish than assume to himself, which is an honest and a thriving way; and yet as much for bravery may be given him in this action as to a man. Honest men," (by these he meant the fanatical independents) "served you faithfully, in this action, sir; they are trusty; I beseech you, in the name of God, not to discourage them. I wish this action may beget thankfulness and humility in all that are concerned in it. He that ventures his life for the liberty of his country, I wish he trust God for the liberty of his conscience, and you for the liberty he fights for."²

Some were offended at seeing a subordinate officer, a servant of parliament, as they said, distribute advice and praise in such a tone; but their displeasure had little effect amidst the public exultation; and the day on which Cromwell's letter reached London, the lords themselves voted that his command should be extended to three months longer (June 16).³

They voted, at the same time, that advantage ought to be taken of this victory to address to the king reasonable proposals (June 20),⁴ and the Scottish commissioners expressed the same feeling (July 28).⁵ But the conquerors were very far from any such idea. Instead of answering, the commons requested (June 30) that the whole body of citizens should

¹ Rushworth, i. 4, 42-44; Clarendon, ii. 985, &c.; Whitelocke, 151; May, Breviary, 128.

² Rushworth, i. 4, 45, 46.

³ Ib. 375.

⁴ Parl. Hist. iii. 371.

⁵ Ib. 389.

oe invited to assemble at Guildhall to hear read the papers found among the king's baggage, particularly his letters to the queen, that they might judge for themselves what trust could thenceforward be placed in negotiation. Fairfax had hesitated to open these papers, but Cromwell and Ireton had combated his scruples, and the house had not shared them. The reading took place (July 3) in the midst of an immense concourse of people,¹ and had a prodigious effect. It was clear that the king had never desired peace; that in his eyes no concession was definitive, no promise obligatory; that, in reality, he relied only on force, and still aimed at absolute power; finally that, despite protestations a thousand times repeated, he was negotiating with the king of France, the duke of Lorraine, with all the princes of the continent, to have foreign soldiers sent into England for his purposes. Even the name of parliament, which just before, to obtain the conference at Uxbridge, he had seemed to give the houses at Westminster, was but a deception on his part, for, in giving it, he had privately protested against his official proceeding, and caused his protest to be inscribed on the minutes of the council at Oxford.² Every citizen was allowed to convince himself, with his own eyes, that these letters were really in the king's own handwriting;³ and after the meeting at Guildhall, the parliament had them published.⁴

Anger became universal; the friends of peace were reduced to silence. Some attempted, but in vain, to prevent this publication, a gross violation, they said, of domestic secrets. They asked how far their authenticity could be relied on, whether it was not probable that several had been mutilated and others altogether omitted;⁵ they insinuated that in par-

¹ Parl. Hist. iii. 377; May, Breviary, 129.

² Letters from the king to the queen, of the 2nd and 9th of January, 15th and 10th of February; 5th, 19th, and 30th of March; Ludlow's Mem.; Evelyn's Mem. App. ii. 90; App. xiii.

³ May, *ut sup.*

⁴ Under the title of "The King's Cabinet opened, or certain packets of secret letters and papers, written by the king's hand, and taken from his portfolio on the field of battle of Naseby, the 14th of June, 1645, by the victorious sir Thomas Fairfax, in which are revealed many mysteries of state, which fully justify the cause for which sir Thomas Fairfax gave battle on that memorable day; with notes."

⁵ The king never denied the authenticity of these letters; he even expressly acknowledges it in a letter written to sir Edward Nicholas, on the 4th of

liament, also, there were certain men who had negotiated with no greater sincerity, and were equally determined against peace; but no explanation, no excuse is received by a people when it has once discovered that an attempt has been made to deceive it. Besides, admitting all this, the king's bad faith remained evident, and, to secure peace, it was to him they must look. War alone was now spoken of; the levies of troops were hurried on, taxes energetically collected, the estates of delinquents sold, all the troops received their pay, all the more important towns were thoroughly supplied with ammunition.¹ The Scots, at last, consented to advance into the interior of the kingdom (July 2);² and Fairfax, finding no longer even fugitives to pursue, had resumed his march (June 20), for the purpose of carrying out in the western counties the object which the siege of Oxford had obliged him to suspend.

Everything was changed in these counties, hitherto the bulwark of the royal cause; not that the opinion of the people had become more favourable to parliament, but that it was alienated from the king. He still, indeed, possessed there several regiments, and almost all the towns; but the war was no longer carried on there as in the outset, by steady, respected, popular men—the marquis of Hertford, sir Bevil Greenville, lord Hopton, Trevannion, Slanning, disinterested friends of the crown: some of these were dead, others disgusted, estranged by court intrigues, and sacrificed by the king's weakness. In their stead, two intriguers, lord Goring and sir Richard Greenville, commanded there—one the most debauched, the other the most rapacious of the cavaliers; no principle, no affection attached them to the royal cause, but by making war in its name, they obtained the opportunity of gratifying their own passions, of oppressing their enemies, of revenging, enjoying, enriching themselves. Goring was brave, beloved by his men, and not deficient either in skill or energy on the field of battle; but nothing could equal his recklessness and the insolent intemperance of his conduct and

August, 1645, which was a few weeks after the publication (Sir John Evelyn's *Memoirs*, Appendix, ii. 101); and the text published by parliament is exactly the same as that inserted in the '*Works of Charles I.*' published in London, 1660.

¹ *Parl. Hist.*, iii. 377

his language even. Nor was his loyalty to be relied upon; he had already betrayed, first the king,¹ then the parliament,² and seemed always on the point of some new treason.³ Sir Richard Greenville, less disorderly and more influential with the nobility of the country, was stern and insatiable, and his courage, if not dubious, at all events not very eager. He passed his time in levying contributions for troops which he did not collect, or for expeditions which he did not even take the trouble to begin. The army was changed as well as its leaders; it was no longer a party risen in defence of its affections and its interests—frivolous, indeed, but sincere, licentious but devoted; it was a rabble of vagabonds, utterly indifferent to the cause, committing day and night the most intolerable excesses, and disgusting; by their vices, a country ruined by their extortions. The prince of Wales, or rather his council, reduced to make use of such men, wore themselves out in fruitless efforts by turns to satisfy or to control them; sometimes to protect the people against them, at others to induce the people to take their place.⁴

The people, however, no longer responded to the appeal; they ere long went further. Thousands of peasants met, and, under the name of "clubmen," went in arms about the country. They had no party views, they did not declare for the parliament; all they wished was, to keep the ravages of war from their villages and fields, and they set upon whomsoever they had reason to apprehend these ravages from, without asking under what name they carried on their spoliations. Already, the year before, some bands had assembled in the same manner in Worcestershire and Dorsetshire, provoked by the violence of prince Rupert. In the month of March, 1645, the clubmen became, in the western counties, a permanent, regular, organized force, even commanded by gentlemen, of whom some had served in the king's army, and constantly engaged in the defence of property and persons, and in asserting order and peace. They treated with the troops and garrisons of both parties, undertaking to supply them with provisions, on condition that

¹ In 1641, at the time the army first conspired against the parliament.

² In August, 1642, at the beginning of the civil war, by giving up Portsmouth to the king, of which place parliament had appointed him the governor.

³ Clarendon, ii. *passim*.

⁴ *Id.* ib.

they would not seize any with violence, even sometimes prevented them from coming to blows, and they had inscribed on their rustic colours these words:

"If you offer to plunder our cattle,
Be assured we will give you battle."

So long as the royalists prevailed in the west, it was against them the clubmen assembled, and it was with the parliamentarians that they seemed disposed to combine. Now they threatened to burn the houses of whomsoever refused to join them in exterminating the cavaliers,² and invited Massey, who commanded in the name of the parliament in Worcestershire, to come with them and besiege Hereford, whence the cavaliers infested the country.³ On the 2nd of June, at Wells, six thousand of them addressed a petition to the prince of Wales, complaining of Goring, and notwithstanding the prince's orders, refused to separate.⁴ In the beginning of July, Fairfax arrived as a conqueror in the west; the cavaliers were intimidated and ceased to devastate the country. The clubmen immediately turned against Fairfax and his soldiers.⁵ But Fairfax had a good army, well paid, well provisioned, in which enthusiasm and discipline lent each other a mutual support. He dealt gently with the clubmen, negotiated with them, personally attended some of their meetings, and promised them peace while vigorously prosecuting war. In a few days the campaign was at an end. Goring, surprised and beaten at Langport, in Somersetshire (July 10), left the remnant of his troops to disperse whither they liked; sir Richard Greenville sent his commission of field-marshal to the prince of Wales, impudently complaining that he had been made to carry on the war at his own expense;⁶ and three weeks after the arrival of Fairfax, the cavaliers, who had lately traversed the west of England as masters, were almost all shut up in the towns, which Fairfax next prepared to besiege.

Meantime, in every direction, people were asking one

¹ Clarendon, ii. 907; Letter from Fairfax to the committee of the two kingdoms, July 3, 1645; Parl. Hist., iii. 380; Whitelocke, *passim*; Neal, iii. 90.

² Whitelocke, 136

³ *Ib.*, *passim*.

⁴ Clarendon, *ut sup.*

⁵ Parl. Hist., iii. 380—386.

⁶ Clarendon, ii. 1008.

another what the king was doing—nay, where he was, for scarcely any one knew. After the disaster of Naseby he had fled from town to town, scarcely giving himself any repose, and taking sometimes the road to the north, sometimes that to the west, to join Montrose or Goring, according to the mobility of his fears and projects. On arriving at Hereford, he resolved to go into Wales, where he hoped to recruit his infantry, sent prince Rupert to Bristol, and proceeded himself to Ragland castle, the seat of the marquis of Worcester, the chief of the catholic party, and the richest nobleman in England. Secret projects, in which the catholics alone could aid him, regulated this determination. Besides, for three years the marquis had given the king proofs of inexhaustible devotion; he had lent him 100,000*l.*, had levied at his own expense two regiments, under the command of his son, lord Herbert, earl of Glamorgan, and notwithstanding his age and infirmities, personally superintended a strong garrison in his own castle. He received the king with respectful pomp, assembled the nobility of the neighbourhood, and surrounded him with the festivities, the sports, the homage, the pleasures of a court. The fugitive Charles breathed freely for awhile, as if restored to his natural position; and for more than a fortnight, forgetting his misfortunes, his perils, his kingdom, only thought of enjoying his renewed royalty.¹

The news of the disasters in the west, drew him at last from this illusive apathy. At the same time, he learned that in the north the Scots had taken Carlisle (June 28), and were marching towards the south, meditating the siege of Hereford. He left Ragland to go to the assistance of Goring, but had scarcely reached the banks of the Severn, before the ill condition of the new levies, the dissensions among the officers, and a thousand unforeseen difficulties discouraged him, and he returned into Wales. He was at Cardiff, not knowing upon what to resolve; when a letter was delivered to him, written by prince Rupert to the duke of Richmond, to be shown to the king. The prince considered that all was lost, and counselled peace, on whatever terms. As soon as his honour seemed in danger, Charles regained an energy which he never had when his mere personal safety was in-

¹ Walker's Discourses, 132.

volved. He at once replied to his nephew thus (Aug. 3) "If I had any other quarrel but the defence of my religion, crown, and friends, you had full reason for your advice. For I confess, that speaking either as to mere soldier or statesman, I must say there is no probability but of my ruin; but as to Christian, I must tell you, that God will not suffer rebels to prosper, or his cause to be overthrown: and whatever personal punishment it shall please him to inflict upon me must not make me repine, much less to give over this quarrel. I must avow to-all my friends, that he that will stay with me at this time, must expect and resolve either to die for a good cause, or which is worse, to live as miserable in the maintaining it as the violence of insulting rebels can make him.—For God's sake, let us not flatter ourselves with these conceits; and believe me, the very imagination that you are desirous of a treaty, will lose me so much the sooner;"¹ and, to rally his dejected adherents, recalling himself all his courage, he at once quitted Wales, passed, without being observed, the quarters of the Scottish army already encamped under the walls of Hereford, rapidly traversed Shropshire, Staffordshire, Derbyshire, and Nottinghamshire, and, arriving safely in Yorkshire, summoned all his faithful cavaliers in the north to go with him to join Montrose, like them faithful, and still victorious.²

The cavaliers hastened to obey the summons; the presence of the king, who had so long lived among them, excited a warm enthusiasm throughout the country; at the first mention of levying a regiment of infantry, large bodies of men, among the rest, the late garrisons of Pontefract and Scarborough, which had been obliged to surrender for want of provisions, and were now at liberty, came forward, and in three days nearly three thousand men had offered their services to the king, promising to be ready, within twenty-four hours, to march at a moment's notice. They now only waited for a letter from Montrose, to know whether they should go and join him in Scotland or meet him in England. All at once, they learned that David Lesley, at the head of the Scottish cavalry, had quitted the siege of Hereford, and was already at Rotherham, ten miles from Doncaster, seeking everywhere for the king. The

disaster of Naseby had given an effectual blow to the imagination of the royalists; their confidence was no longer proof against the approach of danger. Many quitted Doncaster, and no others took their place: in the opinion of even the bravest, it was too late to attempt a junction with Montrose; the king's safety was now the sole point to be attended to. He departed, followed by about fifteen hundred horse, traversed without obstacle the centre of the kingdom, even defeated on the road a few parliamentary detachments, and re-entered Oxford on the 29th of August, not knowing what to do with the handful of troops which now remained to him.¹

He had been there two days, when the news reached him of the recent and prodigious success of Montrose in Scotland; it was no longer merely in the extreme north of the kingdom, among the highlanders, that the royal cause was triumphant; Montrose had advanced towards the south, into the lowlands; and on the 15th of August, at Kilsyth, not far from the ruins of the Roman wall, had obtained over the covenanters, commanded by Baillie, the seventh and most splendid of his victories. The hostile army was destroyed; all the neighbouring towns, Bothwell, Glasgow, even Edinburgh, had opened their gates to the conqueror; all the royalists whom the Scottish parliament had detained in prison, were released; all the timid, who had waited for some decided success to declare themselves, the marquis of Douglas, the earls of Annandale and Linlithgow, the lords Seaton, Drummond, Erskine, Carnegie, &c., now disputed which should be first to offer his services to the king, fearing to be too late. The parliamentarian leaders were flying in every direction, some to England, others to Ireland.² Finally, the cavalry of the Scottish army, who were besieging Hereford, were recalled in all haste to defend their own country. Some even said, that when of late Lesley appeared in the neighbourhood of Doncaster, far from seeking to encounter the king, he was on his march towards Scotland, and that the royalists had been utterly mistaken in their fears.³

¹ Walker, 135, 136; Rushworth, i. 4, 116.

² Rushworth, i. 4, 230; Guthrie, *Memoirs*, &c., 189.

³ Rushworth, i. 4, 231. Lesley had left the siege of Hereford in the first days of August, and the battle of Kilsyth did not take place till the 15th. It is therefore evident that he detached himself from the Scottish army to follow the king, and could not have been at that time recalled to the assistance of his country.

At this glorious intelligence, Charles's courage revived, and he immediately departed from Oxford (Aug. 31), to march against the Scottish army, take advantage of its reduced state, and compel it at least to raise the siege of Hereford. On his way, as he passed Ragland, he was informed that Fairfax had just invested Bristol, the most important of his possessions in the west; but the place was strong, and prince Rupert, who defended it with a good garrison, promised to hold out four months, at least: the king therefore felt no anxiety respecting it. When he was yet a day's journey from Hereford, he learned that the Scots, at the news of his approach, had raised the siege, and were precipitately retreating towards the north. He was urged to pursue them; they were disconcerted, fatigued, in disorder, and were traversing a country ill-disposed towards them; to harass them would perhaps suffice to destroy them. But Charles was fatigued himself by an activity which surpassed his strength; he must, he said, go to the succour of Bristol; and pending the arrival of some troops recalled from the west for this purpose, he returned to Ragland castle, attracted by the charms of that place, or to discuss with the marquis of Worcester the great and mysterious affair which they were arranging together.¹

He had scarcely arrived when he received the most unexpected news, prince Rupert had surrendered Bristol (Sept. 11)² at the first attack, almost without resistance, though he wanted nothing, ramparts, provisions, nor soldiers. Charles was in utter consternation; it was the entire ruin of his affairs in the west. He wrote to the prince:³ "Nephew,—though the loss of Bristol be a great blow to me, yet your surrendering it as you did, is of so much affliction to me, that it makes me not only forget the consideration of that place, but is likewise the greatest trial of my constancy that hath yet befallen me. For what is to be done, after one that is so near me as you are, both in blood and friendship, submits himself to an action so mean (I give it the easiest term), an action so——I have so much to say, that I will say no more of it; only, least rashness of judgment be laid to my charge, I must remember you of your letter of the 12th of

¹ Clarendon, ii. 1041; Walker, 136; Rushworth, i. 4, 121.

² Rushworth, i. 4, 65.

³ From Hereford, 14th of September

August, wherein you assured me that if no mutiny happened, you would keep Bristol for four months. Did you keep it four days? Was there anything like a mutiny? More questions might be asked, but now, I confess, to little purpose; my conclusion is to desire you to seek your subsistence, until it shall please God to determine of my condition, somewhere beyond seas; to which end I send you herewith a pass. And I pray God to make you sensible of your present condition, and give you means to redeem what you have lost; for I shall have no greater joy in a victory than a just occasion, without blushing, to assure you of my being your loving uncle and most faithful friend,

CHARLES R.¹

He wrote the same day to Oxford,² whither the prince had retired, to order the lords of the council to demand the prince's commissions, watch his proceedings, dismiss colonel William Legge, an intimate friend of Rupert, from his post as governor of Oxford, and to arrest the colonel, and even the prince, if any disturbance was excited; and his letter concluded with this postscript: "Tell my son I would rather hear of his death, than of his doing so cowardly an act as this surrender of Bristol."³

One resource was left to the king, the same which he had already attempted in vain—to join Montrose. It was, moreover, necessary for him to march towards the north, to relieve Chester, again besieged, and which, now Bristol was lost, was the only port where succours from Ireland, his sole remaining hope, could land. After a week spent at Hereford in deep despondency, he set off over the Welsh mountains, the only road by which he could escape a body of parliamentarians, who, under the command of major-general Poyntz, were watching all his motions. He was still accompanied by about five thousand men, Welch infantry and northern horse. He was already within sight of Chester, when the parliamentarians, who had started later, but had found a more direct and better road, came upon his rear-guard (at Rounton Heath, Sept. 24.)⁴ Sir Marmaduke Langdale, who commanded it,

¹ Clarendon, ii. 1042.

² To the secretary of state, sir Edward Nicholas.

³ Clarendon, *ut sup.*; Evelyn, *Memoirs*, ii. App. 107–109.

⁴ Rushworth, i. 4, 117; Clarendon, ii. 1069.

charged the enemy with so much vigour, that he forced them to fall back in disorder. But colonel Jones, who directed the siege, detached a body of troops under his own orders and appeared suddenly in the royalist rear. Poyntz rallied his men. The king, placed between two fires, saw his best officers fall around him, and, soon put to flight himself, returned utterly desperate into Wales, once more driven back, as by an insurmountable barrier, from the camp of Montrose, his last hope.

This hope itself was now only a delusion; for the last ten days Montrose, like the king, was a fugitive, seeking an asylum and soldiers. On the 13th of September, at Philip-Haugh, in Ettrick forest, near the border, Lesley, whose approach he was quite unconscious of, surprised him, weak and ill-guarded. Despite all his efforts, the highlanders had left him to return home, and so secure their plunder. Some lords, the earl of Aboyne among others, jealous of his glory, had also quitted him with their vassals; others, such as lords Traquair, Hume, Roxburgh, mistrusting his fortune, notwithstanding their promises,¹ had not joined him. Bold, brilliant in his designs, in mean hearts he excited envy, and inspired no security in the timid. There was, moreover, a love of display, and somewhat of the braggadocio in his character, which was injurious to his influence: his officers served him with earnest devotion, his soldiers with enthusiasm, but he did not produce the same effect upon his equals. His power, besides, had no other foundation than his victories, and prudent men, daily an increasing class, looked upon him with surprise, as a meteor which nothing checks, but which has only a certain course to run. One reverse of fortune sufficed to dissipate all his *éclat*; and the day after his defeat, the conqueror of Scotland was nothing but an audacious outlaw.

On hearing of this blow, Charles cast his eyes around him with terror, utterly at a loss where to place his hope. He was deficient even in councillors. The wisest of them, lord Capel Colepepper, and Hyde, he had placed with his son; lord Digby was almost the only one remaining, adventurous, confident as ever, always ready to oppose projects to defeats; and, notwithstanding the sincerity of his zeal, intent above

¹ Rushworth, i. 4, 231; Guthrie, Memoirs, 108.

all things on retaining his influence. At one time, the king entertained the idea of retiring to spend the winter in Anglesey, an island on the coast of Wales, within easy reach of Ireland, and susceptible of a stout defence. He was easily dissuaded from thus forsaking his kingdom, where he still possessed strong places, such as Worcester, Hereford, Chester, Oxford, and Newark. Every one else inclined to Worcester, but nothing could be less palatable to lord Digby's views. The declared enemy of prince Rupert, it was he who, after the surrender of Bristol, had fomented the king's anger, and urged, it was said, the severity he had exercised towards his nephew. He well knew that Rupert, whose fury had not yet subsided, was determined to see the king, to justify himself, and take his revenge. Now at Worcester, he could easily accomplish this, for prince Maurice, his brother, was governor of that town. Of all the places to which the king could retire, Newark was that where prince Rupert would have the greatest difficulty in obtaining an audience. To the great surprise of all around him, the king decided upon going to Newark.¹

The prince was soon informed of this; and, notwithstanding his prohibition, immediately set out for Newark to see the king. Charles repeated that he would not receive him; but lord Digby, for all that, grew uneasy. Whether by chance or by design, a report all at once circulated that Montrose had retrieved his defeat, had beaten Lesley, and was just on the borders. Without waiting for further information, the king set out with lord Digby and two thousand horse, to make a third attempt to join him. The error under which he was acting was speedily dissipated; after two days' march, they had certain intelligence that Montrose, without any soldiers at all, was still wandering in the highlands. The king could do nothing but return to Newark, as Digby himself admitted. But fully resolved not to return there at the risk of encountering prince Rupert, he persuaded the king that, at whatever cost, aid must be sent to Montrose, and he undertook to convey it. They parted; Digby, with fifteen hundred horse, nearly all the king had left, continued his route towards the north; and Charles returned to Newark

¹ Clarendon, ii. 1073

with three or four hundred horse as his entire army, and John Ashburnham, his valet de chambre, as his council.¹

On his arrival, he heard that Rupert was at Belvoir castle, nine miles off, with his brother Maurice, and an escort of one hundred and twenty officers. He sent him word to remain there until further orders, already angry that he had come so near without his consent. But the prince still advanced, and many officers of the garrison of Newark, even the governor, sir Richard Willis, went to meet him. He arrived, and without being announced, presented himself, with all his suite, before the king. "Sire," he said, "I am come to render an account of the loss of Bristol, and to clear myself from the imputations which have been cast on me." Charles, as perplexed as irritated, scarcely answered him. It was supper time; the prince's escort withdrew; the royal party sat down to table; the king talked with Maurice without addressing a word to Rupert, and, supper over, retired to his room. Rupert went and took up his abode with the governor. The next day, however, the king consented to the calling of a council of war, and after a few hours' sitting, a declaration was given, stating that the prince had not been deficient either in courage or fidelity. No solicitation could obtain more than this from the king.

It was too little to satisfy the prince and his partisans. They remained at Newark, giving unrestrained vent to their anger. The king, on his side, undertook to put an end to the growing excesses of the garrison. For two thousand men, there were twenty-four officers, generals or colonels, whose maintenance absorbed nearly all the contributions of the county.² The gentlemen of the neighbourhood, even those of the most devoted loyalty, bitterly complained of the governor. Charles resolved to remove him, but, out of consideration for appearances, to give him some office about his person. He therefore informed him that he was appointed colonel of his horse guards. Sir Richard refused, saying, that people would regard this promotion as a disgrace; that he was too poor for the court: "I will see to that," said the king, dismissing him. The very same day, at dinner time, when Charles was at table, sir Richard Willis, the two princes, lord Gerrard,

¹ Clarendon, ii. 1078.

² Ib. 1079.

and twenty officers of the garrison abruptly entered: "What your majesty said to me this morning in private," said Willis, "is now the public talk of the town, and very much to my dishonour." "It is not for any fault," added Rupert, "that sir Richard loses his government, but because he is my friend." "All this," said lord Gerrard, "is a plot of lord Digby's, who is himself a traitor, and I will prove it."

Astonished and perplexed, Charles rose from the table, and moving a few steps towards his private apartment, ordered Willis to follow him: "No, sire," replied Willis; "I received a public injury, and I expect a public satisfaction." At this, Charles, losing all self-command, pale with anger, sprang towards them, and with a loud voice and threatening gesture, said: "Quit my presence, and come no more near me." Agitated in their turn, they all hastily went out, returned to the governor's house, sounded to horse, and left the town, to the number of two hundred cavaliers.

All the garrison, all the inhabitants hastened to offer the king the expression of their devotion and respect. In the evening, the malcontents sent to him for passports, begging him not to consider this as a mutiny: "I shall not now christen it," said the king; "but it looks very like one. As for passports, let them have as many as they please."¹ He was still full of agitation at this scene, when he received the intelligence that lord Digby, in his march towards Scotland, had been overtaken and beaten at Sherborne by a detachment of parliamentarians (towards the middle of October, 1645);² that his cavaliers were dispersed, and he himself gone none knew whither. So there remained in the direction of the north neither soldiers nor hope. Even Newark was no longer safe: Poyntz's troops had approached, taking possession successively of all the neighbouring places, drawing their lines every day closer and closer round it, so that it was already a question whether the king could pass. On the 3rd of November, at eleven o'clock at night, four or five hundred cavaliers, the wreck of several regiments, were assembled in the market-place: the king appeared, took the command of a squadron, and left Newark by the Oxford road. He had had his beard shaved off; two small royalist garrisons, situated

¹ Clarendon, ii. 1063.

² Ib. 1077; Rushworth, i. 4, 128.

on his way, had received notice of his design; he travelled day and night, with difficulty avoiding the enemy, and thought himself saved when he re-entered Oxford (Nov. 6, 1645); for there he found once more his council, his court, his ordinary mode of life, and somewhat of rest.¹

He soon found misery also: while he had been wandering from county to county, from town to town, Fairfax and Cromwell, having nothing to fear from him, and certain that the troops of Poyntz would suffice to harass him, had pursued the course of their successes in the west. In less than five months, fifteen places of importance, Bridgewater (July 23, 1645), Bath (July 29), Sherborne (Aug. 15), Devizes (Sept. 23), Winchester (Sept. 28), Basing-House (Oct. 14), Tiverton (Oct. 19), Monmouth (Oct. 22), &c., had fallen into their hands. To such garrisons as shewed themselves disposed to listen to their overtures, they unhesitatingly granted honourable conditions; where a less compliant answer was given, they immediately proceeded to storm.² For a moment the clubmen gave them some uneasiness. After having dispersed them several times by fair words, Cromwell at last found himself obliged to attack them. He did so suddenly and fiercely, skilful in passing all at once, according to circumstances, from gentleness to severity, from severity to gentleness. By his advice, parliament denounced as high treason all associations of the kind (Aug. 23);³ some of the leaders were arrested; the strict discipline of the army reassured the people; the clubmen soon disappeared; and when the king re-entered Oxford, the situation of his party in the west was so desperate, that next morning (Nov. 7) he wrote to the prince of Wales directing him to hold himself ready to pass over to the continent.⁴

For himself, he had no plan—no idea what to do; now a prey to passionate anguish, now seeking to forget in repose the feeling of his utter powerlessness. He invited, however, the council to point out some expedient to him, some method of proceeding from which a favourable result might be looked for. There was no choice left: the council proposed a message

¹ Clarendon, ii. 1085; Walker, 146; Evelyn, *Mem.* ii. App. 109.

² Rushworth, i. 4, 69

³ Parl. Hist. iii. 390; Whitelocke, 167.

⁴ Clarendon, ii. 1062.

to parliament, and the request of a safe conduct for four negotiators. The king consented without a single objection.¹

Never had parliament been less inclined for peace. One hundred and thirty members had just entered the house of commons, in place of those who had left it to follow the king. Long postponed, first from caution, then from the difficulty of its execution, afterwards by design, this measure had at last been adopted at the demand of the independents, eager to take advantage of their successes on the field of battle to strengthen their party at Westminster.² They set every engine to work to carry the new elections, appointing them separately one after another, even having them delayed or put forward, according to the chances in their favour; employing both deceit and violence, as is the wont of conquerors still in a minority. Several men, soon afterwards famous in the party, now entered parliament—Fairfax, Ludlow, Ireton, Blake, Sidney, Hutchinson, Fleetwood. Still the elections had not everywhere the same result: many counties sent to Westminster men, who, though opposed to the court, were strangers to faction, and friends to legal order and peace. But they were without experience, without combination, without leaders, and little disposed to rally round their old presbyterian chiefs, who had, most of them at all events, lost their reputation respectively of uprightness, or energy, or ability. They made little sensation, exercised little influence; and the first effect of this filling up of the house was to give to the independents greater daring and power.³ The acts of parliament thenceforward assumed a sterner character. It had been ascertained that, during their stay in London, the king's commissioners were intriguing to form plots and stir

¹ Clarendon, ii. 1116; Parl. Hist. iii. 405. The message was dated 5th of December, 1645.

² It was on the 18th of September, 1644, that it was first proposed in the house of commons to fill up the vacant places. The proposal had no result till August, 1645. On the 21st of that month, upon a petition from the borough of Southwark, the house voted, by a majority of only three, that five of the absent members should be replaced; namely, the members for Southwark, Bury St. Edmund's, and Hythe. One hundred and forty-six new members were elected in the five last months of 1645. Out of fifty-eight signatures to the order for the execution of Charles I., seventeen were those of members elected at this epoch. In 1646, there were eighty-nine new elections.—*Journals, Commons.*

³ Holles, *Memoirs*, 42; Ludlow, *passim*; Whitelocke, 166, and *passim*.

up the people; it was decided (Aug. 11)¹ that no more commissioners should be received, that there should be no more negotiations, that the house should draw up their proposals in the form of bills, and that the king should be called upon simply to adopt or reject them, as if he were at Whitehall and proceeding according to the regular practice. The prince of Wales (Sept. 20)² offered to mediate between the king and the people, and Fairfax transmitted his letter to the house; "Thinking it a duty," he said, "not to hinder the hopeful blossom of your young peacemaker." He did not even receive an answer. The term of Cromwell's command was nearly expired; it was prolonged another four months without any reason being assigned (Aug. 12.)³ The rigour against the royalists redoubled: a late ordinance had granted to the wives and children of delinquents one-fifth of the revenue of sequestered estates; it was repealed (Sept. 8.)⁴ Another act, for a long time resisted by the lords, directed the sale of a considerable portion of the possessions of bishops and delinquents (Sept. 13.)⁵ In the camp, in the warfare, the same revolution took place. It was forbidden to give any quarter to the Irish taken in England bearing arms (Oct. 24);⁶ they were shot by hundreds,⁷ or tied back to back, and thrown into the sea. Even among the English, there was no longer exhibited that mutual forbearance and courtesy which characterized the first campaigns, revealing, in the two parties, a condition well nigh equal, the same education and manners, the habit and desire of peace, even amidst war. In the parliamentary ranks, Fairfax almost alone retained this refined humanity; round him, officers and soldiers, brave and skilful *parvenus*, but of rough manners, or fanatics of a dark and violent temperament, who had no thought but of victory; no idea of the cavaliers but as enemies to be got rid of. The cavaliers, on their side, irritated at being defeated by such vulgar antagonists, sought consolation or revenge in ridicule, epigrams, and songs, daily more and more insulting.⁸ Thus the war assumed a

¹ Parl. Hist. iii. 300.

² Ib. 302.

³ Ib. 300.

⁴ Rushworth, ii. 4, 209.

⁵ Parl. Hist. iii. 391; Whitelocke, 172.

⁶ Rushworth, ii. 3, 783.

⁷ Baillie, Letters, ii. 164; Rushworth, i. 4, 231.

⁸ The most remarkable of these songs are those which were composed against David Leslie and his Scots, when he left the siege of Hereford to go to the assistance of Scotland, almost entirely subjugated by Montrose,

stern, at times even a cruel character, as between men whose only feeling was mutual scorn and hate. At the same time, the misunderstanding, hitherto kept in check, between the Scots and the parliament, broke out unrestrainedly; the former complained that their army was not paid; the latter, that an army of allies should pillage and devastate, as though they were a hostile force, the counties which they occupied.¹ In every quarter, in short, excitement more ardent than ever, hatred more profound, measures harsher and more decisive, left but little chance of peace being allowed to put a stop to, or even a truce to suspend the already so rapid course of events.

The king's overtures were rejected, and a safe-conduct denied to his negotiators. He urged the point by two other messages, still without success; he was told that the past intrigues of his courtiers in the city rendered it impossible they should be allowed to return there (Dec. 26).² He offered himself to come to Westminster to treat in person with the parliament (Dec. 26 and 30);³ notwithstanding the entreaties of the Scots, this proposal met with as ill a reception as the others (Jan. 13).⁴ He renewed his entreaties (Jan. 15),⁵ less from any hope of success, than to discredit the parliament in the opinion of the people who wished for peace. But his enemies had lately acquired a still surer means of discrediting the king himself; they solemnly proclaimed that they at last possessed the proof of his duplicity; that he had just concluded with the Irish, not merely a suspension of arms, but a treaty of alliance; that ten thousand of these rebels, under the command of the earl of Glamorgan, were soon to land at Chester; that the price of this odious aid was the complete abolition of the penal laws against the catholics, full liberty for their worship, the acknowledgment of their right to the churches and lands which they had taken possession of; in other words, the triumph of popery in Ireland and the ruin

whom he defeated on the 13th of September, 1645, at the battle of Philiphaugh. No defeat had yet snatched from the cavaliers such brilliant hopes, and their anger vented itself with energy, in a vein of poetical animation which was then very extraordinary. For one of the most spirited of these songs, see Appendix No. XLV.

¹ Parl. Hist. iii. 393, 394, 398, 405.

² Ib. 414.

³ Ib. 415—417.

⁴ Ib. 418—421.

⁵ Ib. 421.

of the protestants. A copy of the treaty, and several letters relating to it, had been found in the carriage of the archbishop of Tuam, one of the rebel leaders killed by chance in a skirmish under the walls of Sligo (Oct. 17, 1645). The committee of the two kingdoms, who for three months had kept these documents in reserve for some important occasion, now laid them before parliament, which immediately ordered them to be published.¹

The king was utterly disconcerted; the facts were real; nay, parliament did not know all. For nearly two years,² Charles had been carrying on this negotiation in person, unknown to his party, his council, even making some points a secret from the marquis of Ormond, his lieutenant in Ireland, though he did not doubt his zeal, and could not stir without his assistance; a Roman catholic, lord Herbert, eldest son of the marquis of Worcester, and himself recently created earl of Glamorgan, alone possessed, in this affair, the king's entire confidence. Brave, generous, reckless, passionately devoted to his master in peril and to his religion oppressed, it was Glamorgan who went backwards and forwards incessantly between England and Ireland, or between Dublin and Kilkenny, undertaking what Ormond refused to do, and alone knowing how far the king's concessions would extend. It was he who conducted the correspondence of Charles with Rinuccini, the pope's nuncio, who had lately arrived in Ireland (Oct. 22, 1645), and with the pope himself. In short, the king had formally authorized him, by an act signed with his own hand (dated March 12, 1645), and known to themselves alone, to grant the Irish all he should judge necessary to obtain from them efficacious help, undertaking to approve all, to ratify all, however illegal the concessions might be, desiring only that nothing should transpire till the day when he could with effect avow the whole. The treaty had been concluded the preceding 20th of August, and Glamorgan, who was still in Ireland, earnestly pressed forward its execution. This was the secret of those frequent visits, those long sojourns of the king at Ragland castle, the residence of

¹ Parl. Hist., iii. 428; Rushworth, i. 4, 238, *et seq.*

² The first commission of the king to Glamorgan was dated April 1, 1644.

the marquis of Worcester, and of those mysterious hopes which he sometimes gave half-utterance to amidst his reverses.¹

They heard almost at the same time, at Oxford and at Dublin, that the treaty was known in London. Ormond at once comprehended how severe a blow it would inflict upon the king's cause with his own party. Whether he himself was, as he affirmed, really ignorant that Charles had authorized such concessions, or whether, rather, he wished to give him an opportunity of disavowing them, he instantly caused Glamorgan to be arrested (Jan. 4, 1646), as having exceeded his powers, and seriously compromised the king, by granting to the rebels what all the laws denied them. Steadfast in his devotion, Glamorgan remained silent, did not produce the secret instructions signed "Charles," which he had in his possession, and even said that the king was not bound to ratify what he had thought fit to promise in his name. Charles, on his side, hastened to disown him, in a proclamation he addressed to parliament (Jan. 21),² and in his official letters to the council in Dublin (Jan. 31).³ According to him, Glamorgan had no other commission than to raise soldiers and second the efforts of the lord-lieutenant; but, on both sides, falsehood was now merely an old and useless habit; none, not even the people, were any longer deceived by it. In a few days (Feb. 1), Glamorgan was released, and resumed his negotiations for the transmission, on the same terms as before, of an Irish army into England. The parliament voted that the king's justification was not sufficient (Jan. 31).⁴ Cromwell, for the last time, was continued in his command (Jan. 27),⁵ and Charles found himself obliged to seek once more his preservation in war, as though he were able to carry it on.

Only two bodies of troops remained to him: one in Cornwall, under the command of lord Hopton; the other on the frontiers of Wales, under lord Astley. Towards the middle

¹ Mr. Lingard has collected, and clearly stated, all the facts connected with this negotiation, of which he possesses the principal original documents.—*History of England*, 1826, vi. 537—541; 655—664.

² *Parl. Hist.* iii. 435.

³ *Carte's Life of Ormond*, iii. 445—447.

⁴ *Parl. Hist.* iii. 436.

⁵ *Ib.* 428.

of January, the prince of Wales, still governor of the west, but forsaken by his late generals Goring and Greenville, had sent for lord Hopton, who had formerly for a long time commanded in that quarter, to conjure him to resume the command of what remained of the army. "My lord," answered Hopton, "it is now a custom, when men are not willing to submit to what they are enjoined, to say that it is against their honour; that their honour will not suffer them to do this or that; for my part, I cannot at this time obey your highness without resolving to lose my honour; but since your highness has thought fit to command me, I am ready to obey, even with the loss of my honour;" and he took the command of seven or eight thousand men.¹ But he was soon as odious to them as their excesses were to him; even the really brave among them could not endure his discipline and vigilance, accustomed as they had been, under Goring, to a less troublesome and more profitable warfare. Fairfax, still occupied in subduing the west, marched before long against them; and on the 16th of February, Hopton underwent, at Torrington, on the borders of Cornwall, a defeat rather disastrous than bloody. He vainly endeavoured, as he retired from town to town, to recruit his party; he was destitute alike, of officers and of soldiers: "From the hour I undertook this charge," said he, "to the hour of their dissolving, scarce a party or guard appeared with half the number appointed, or within two hours of the time."² Fairfax every day pressed more closely upon him. At the head of the small corps which still remained faithful, Hopton soon found himself driven to the Land's-end. At Truro, he was informed that, weary of the war, the people of the country meditated putting an end to it by seizing the prince of Wales, and giving him up to parliament. The necessity had arrived; the prince embarked, with his council, but only to retire to Scilly, on English land, almost in sight of the coast. Relieved from this anxiety, Hopton wished to try the effect of another battle; but his troops loudly called upon him to capitulate. Fairfax offered him honourable conditions—he still evaded them: his officers declared that if he did not consent, they would treat without

¹ "Fellows," observes Clarendon, "whom only their friends feared and their enemies laughed at, being only terrible in plunder and resolute in running away."—Clarendon, ii. 1089.

² Clarendon, ii. 1097.

him. "Treat, then," said he, "but not for me;" and neither he nor Lord Capel would be included in the capitulation. The articles signed and the army broken up, these noblemen embarked to join the prince at Scilly; and the king now possessed in the west only a few insignificant garrisons.¹

Lord Astley met with no better fortune: he was at Worcester with three thousand men; the king ordered him to join him at Oxford, and set out himself with fifteen hundred horse to meet him. He wished to assemble round him a sufficient corps to wait for the succours from Ireland, which he still expected; but before they met (March 22), sir William Brereton and colonel Morgan, at the head of a body of parliamentarians, overtook Astley, whose movements they had been watching for the last month, at Stow, in Gloucestershire. The defeat of the cavaliers was complete; eighteen hundred of them were killed or taken; the others dispersed. Astley himself, after a desperate resistance, fell into the hands of the enemy; he was old, fatigued by the conflict, and walked with difficulty; the soldiers, touched by his grey hairs and his courage, brought him a drum to rest upon: he sat down upon it, and, addressing Brereton's officers: "Gentlemen," said he, "you have done your work, and may now go to play, unless you prefer to fall out among yourselves."²

This, indeed, was the only hope Charles himself had left; he hastened to try and promote it. Already, at the very time he was loading some of the presbyterian leaders with compromising attentions, he had long kept up a secret correspondence with the independents, particularly with Vane, not less active in intrigue than passionate in enthusiasm. Just before the affair at Stow, the secretary of state Nicholas had written (March 2) to Vane, soliciting him to contrive that the king might be enabled to come to London and treat in person with the parliament, promising that if it required the triumph of presbyterian discipline, the royalists would combine with the independents "to extirpate from the kingdom this tyrannical domination, and secure each other's liberty."³ It is not known what reply Vane sent to this letter; but after Astley's defeat the king himself wrote to him: "Be very

¹ Clarendon, ii. 1102; Rushworth, i. 4, 99—115.

² Rushworth, i. 4, 139—141.

³ Evelyn, *Memoirs*, ii. App. 115.

confident," he said, "that all things shall be performed according to my promise. By all that is good, I conjure you to dispatch that courtesy for me with all speed, or it will be too late; I shall perish before I receive the fruits of it. I may not tell you my necessities; but if it were necessary so to do, I am sure you would lay all other considerations aside and fulfil my desires. This is all; trust me, I will repay the favour to the full. I have done; if I have no answer within four days after the receipt of this, I shall be necessitated to find some other expedient. God direct you! I have discharged my duty."¹ At the same time, he addressed a message to parliament, offering to disband all his troops, to open all his garrisons, and to come and resume his residence at Whitehall (March 23).²

At this proposal, and on the report that, without waiting for an answer, the king was likely to arrive, the greatest alarm prevailed in Westminster; politicians or fanatics, presbyterians or independents, all knew that, the king once at Whitehall, it would no longer be against him that the riots of the city would be directed; all were alike resolved not to subject themselves to his mercy. They at once took, to avert so great a danger, the most violent measures: it was forbidden to receive the king, or to go near him if he came to London, or to give to any one whatever the means of approaching him. The committee of the militia received orders to prevent any public meeting, to arrest any one that should come with the king, to prevent the people from flocking to meet him; even, if necessary, to secure his own person "from all danger," as they put it. Papists, delinquents, cashiered officers, soldiers of fortune, whoever had taken any part against parliament, received orders to quit London within three days (March 31—April 3).³ Ultimately a court-martial was established (April 3),⁴ and the punishment of death decreed against any person who should hold direct or indirect intercourse with the king, or who should come without a pass from any camp or town occupied by the king, or who should receive or conceal any man who had carried arms

¹ Evelyn, *ib.* App. 116; Clarendon, *State Papers* (1773), ii. 227.

² *Parl. Hist.* iii. 451.

³ *ib.* 452—453; Rushworth, i. 4, 249.

Rushworth, i. 4, 252.

against the parliament, or who should wilfully allow a prisoner of war to escape, &c. Never had act of the parliament borne the impress of such terror.

Vane, on his part, left the king's letter without answer, or at least without effect.

Meantime, Fairfax's troops were advancing by forced marches to besiege Oxford. Already Colonel Rainsborough's and two other regiments were encamped in sight of the place. The king offered to give himself up to Rainsborough, if he would pledge his word to conduct him immediately to parliament. Rainsborough refused. In a few days, the blockade could not fail to be complete, and, whatever its duration, the result was infallible; the king must fall as a prisoner of war into the hands of his enemies.

One only refuge remained possible, the Scottish camp. For the last two months, M. de Montreuil, the French minister, touched by Charles's distress rather than to obey the instructions of Mazarin, had been endeavouring to secure for him this last asylum. Rebuffed in the first instance by the Scottish commissioners residing in London, convinced by a journey to Edinburgh that there was nothing to hope from the Scottish parliament, he at last addressed himself to some of the leaders of the army besieging Newark; and their disposition had appeared to him so favourable, that he thought himself warranted in promising the king (April 1), in the name and under the guarantee of the king of France, that the Scots would receive him as their legitimate sovereign, would shelter him and his from all danger, and would even co-operate with him to the utmost of their power in the re-establishment of peace. But the hesitations and retractations of the Scottish officers, who were willing to save the king, but not to quarrel with the parliament, soon showed Montreuil that he had gone too far, and he hastened to send word of his error to Oxford. But necessity, daily more urgent, rendered Charles and Montreuil himself less scrupulous; the queen, who from Paris maintained a correspondence with the agents in the Scottish army, exhorted her husband to trust to it. In later conferences, the officers made some promises to Montreuil. He informed the king of them, repeating, however, that the step was hazardous, and

any other refuge preferable, but adding, that if he could find no other asylum, he would find, for his person, at least, full safety among the Scots.¹

At all events, Charles could wait no longer where he was; Fairfax had already reached Newbury, and the blockade would within three days be complete. On the 27th of April, at midnight, followed only by Ashburnham and an ecclesiastic (Dr. Hudson) who was well acquainted with the roads, the king left Oxford on horseback, disguised as Ashburnham's servant, with their common portmanteau behind him; and, at the same time, to mislead all watchers, three men went out at each gate of the town. The king took the road to London. On arriving at Harrow Hill, in sight of his capital, he stopped for awhile, and anxiously deliberated, whether he should go to London, re-enter Whitehall, appear all at once in the city, where men's thoughts had for some time past been disposed favourably towards him. But nothing less suited him than any singular or daring resolution, for, he was deficient in presence of mind, and, above all things, dreaded any chance of compromising his royal dignity. After a few hours' hesitation, he turned from London and proceeded towards the north, but slowly, almost at random, as a man still yet undetermined. Montreuil had promised to come and meet him at Harborough, in Leicestershire, but he was not there. The king, uneasy at this, sent Hudson to seek him, and turned towards the eastern counties, wandering from town to town, from castle to castle, especially along the coast, continually changing his disguise; and inquiring everywhere for news of Montrose, whom he earnestly desired to join. But this, also, was too tedious and troublesome an enterprise for him. Hudson returned; no change had taken place: Montreuil still promised, if not an agreeable, at least a safe retreat in the Scottish camp. Charles at last made up his mind, as much from weariness as choice; and on the 5th of May, nine days after his departure from Oxford, Montreuil introduced him early in the morning into Kelham, the headquarters of the Scots.²

¹ In his letters of the 15th, 16th, and 20th April; Clarendon, *State Papers*, ii. 211—216.

² Rushworth, i. 4, 267; Clarendon, *State Papers*, ii. 288.

On seeing the king, the earl of Leven and his officers affected extreme surprise; information of his arrival was immediately given to the parliamentary commissioners; expresses were dispatched to announce it in Edinburgh and London. Officers and soldiers treated the king with profound respect; but, in the evening, under the pretext of rendering him due honour, a strong guard was placed at his door; and when, to discover what was his situation, he attempted to give out the watchword for the night, "Pardon me, sire," said Leven, "I am the oldest soldier here: your majesty will permit me to undertake that duty."¹

Malcolm Laing, *Hist. of Scotland*, iii. 352. note 7.

BOOK THE SEVENTH.

1646—1647.

Anxiety and intrigues of the independents—The king's stay at Newcastle—He rejects the proposals of parliament—The parliament negotiates with the Scots, to induce them to give up the king and retire from the kingdom—They consent—The king is conducted to Holmby—Discord breaks out between the parliament and the army—Conduct of Cromwell—He causes the king to be taken from Holmby—The army marches upon London, and impeaches eleven presbyterian leaders—They retire from parliament—Stay of the king at Hampton Court—Negotiations of the army with him—Rising in the city in favour of peace—A great many members of both houses retire to the army—They are brought by the army back to London—Defeat of the presbyterians—Republicans and levellers—Cromwell becomes suspected by the soldiers—They mutiny against the officers—Cromwell's able conduct—Alarm of the king—He escapes to the Isle of Wight.

It was known in London (May 2) that the king had left Oxford, but nothing indicated where he was or whither he was going. There was a report that he was concealed in the city, and whoever should receive him was again menaced with death without mercy. Fairfax sent word that he had proceeded towards the east, and two officers of assured devotion, colonels Russel and Wharton, were immediately despatched in that direction, with orders to seek him everywhere, and at any rate.¹ Parliamentarians and royalists, both plunged in the same uncertainty, bore with equal patience, the former their fears, the latter their hopes.

On the evening of the 6th of May, the news at length arrived that the king was in the Scottish camp. Next day the commons voted that parliament alone had the right

¹ Rushworth, i. 4, 207; Whitelocke, 203.

to dispose of his person, and that he should be conducted without delay to Warwick castle. The lords refused to sanction this vote; but they approved of Poyntz, who was quartered near Newark, receiving orders to watch the movements of the Scottish army; and Fairfax was directed to hold himself ready to march in case of need.¹

The Scots, on their part, desirous of getting away, obtained an order from the king, on the very day of his arrival, for lord Bellasis, the governor of Newark, to open its gates to them; they gave up the town to Poyntz, and a few hours afterwards, placing the king in their advanced guard, marched towards Newcastle, on the frontiers of their own country.²

The independents were full of anxiety and anger. For a year past everything had prospered with them; masters of the army, they had been everywhere conquerors, and had made, by their victories, a deep impression on the imagination of the people; under their banners, ranged themselves all the bold spirits of the time, the men of energetic, ambitious, exalted hopes, whoever had his fortune to make, or had formed rash wishes, or meditated some great design. Genius itself could only find a place and liberty among them. Milton, still young, but already remarkable for the elegance and extent of his knowledge, had just claimed, in nobler language than had yet been heard, liberty of conscience, liberty of the press, the right of divorce;³ and the presbyterian clergy, incensed at his boldness, having without effect reported him to parliament, placed among its sins the toleration of such writings. Another extraordinary man, already known by his passionate resistance to tyranny, John Lilburne, was beginning his indefatigable war against lords, judges, lawyers; and already the most loud-tongued popularity was attached to his name. The number and confidence of the dissenting congregations,⁴ all allied with the independents, daily in-

¹ Parl. Hist. iii. 465, 466.

² Ib. 407; Rushworth, i. 4, 269—271.

³ In five pamphlets, against episcopal government and on the reform of the church, published in 1641 and 1642 in a pamphlet entitled, 'The Doctrine and Discipline of Divorce,' published in 1644; and in a pamphlet entitled, 'Speech for the Liberty of Unlicensed Printing,' published also in 1644.

⁴ The number of anabaptist meetings, for instance, was already fifty-four in 1644. Thomas Edwards, a presbyterian minister, published in 1646, under the title of 'Gangræna,' a catalogue of those sects, to call down the rigour of parliament upon them; he reckoned sixteen principal ones, and had omitted several.—Neal, iii. 310.

creased; it was in vain that the presbyterians had, at length, obtained from parliament the exclusive and official establishment of their church;¹ with the aid of the lawyers and free-thinkers, the independents had succeeded in maintaining the supremacy of parliament in religious affairs;² and the presbyterian measure, thus weakened, was but slowly executed.³ Meantime, the personal fortunes of the leaders of the party, that of Cromwell in particular, progressed rapidly: when they came from the army to Westminster, parliament received them with solemn homage;⁴ when they returned to the army, gifts of money and land, gratuities and offices, lavished on their creatures, attested and extended their influence.⁵ Everywhere, in short, in London as in the counties, and whether as regarded politics or religion, interests or ideas, it was in favour of this party that the social movement had more and more decidedly pronounced itself. In the midst of so much prosperity, just as power was within their reach, they found themselves menaced with the loss of all; for they would indeed lose all if the king and the presbyterians allied against them.

They used every effort to ward off this blow: had they been free to follow their own impulse, they would perhaps have sent the army immediately against the Scots, and taken the king by main force; but notwithstanding their success in the new elections, they were obliged to act with more reserve; with a minority in the upper house, in the lower they only possessed a precarious ascendancy, derived rather from the inexperience of the members recently elected than from their real sentiments. They had recourse to indirect measures; they

¹ By several ordinances or votes of the 23rd of August, 20th of October, and 8th of November, 1645, and the 20th of February and 14th of March, 1646.—Rushworth, i. 4, 205, 210, 224.

² Neal, iii. 231; Journals, Commons, Sept. 25, Oct. 10, 1645; March 5 and 23, April 22, 1646; Baillie, Letters, ii. 194; Parl. Hist., iii. 459.

³ The Presbyterian church was never completely established anywhere but in London and Lancashire.—Laing, iii. 347.

⁴ Parl. Hist. iii. 459, 529.

⁵ The parliament gave, 1, to Cromwell, (February 7, 1646,) landed property to the value of 2,500*l.*, part of the estates of the marquis of Worcester, (Parl. Hist., iii. 489); 2, to Fairfax, a few months after, an income of 5000*l.* (Whitelocks, 238, 239); 3, to sir William Brouncker, in October, 1646, a gratuity of 5000*l.*; 4, to Sir Peter Killigrew, in December, 1646, a gratuity of 2000*l.*—(Ib. 236, 235, &c.)

sought by all kinds of means, daring or crafty, secret or open, to offend the Scots or irritate the people against them, in the hope of bringing about a rupture; the Scottish messengers were stopped and their despatches intercepted, at the very gates of London, by subalterns against whom they claimed justice in vain (May 9);¹ petitions flocked in against them from the northern counties, relating their exactions, their excesses, and the sufferings the people endured at their hands.² Alderman Foot presented one petition, in the name of the city, in their favour (May 26),³ and requiring, on the other hand, the repression of the new sectaries, as authors of the troubles in church and state; the lords thanked the common council, but the commons scarcely vouchsafed a brief, dry answer. There were still a few regiments left, the remnant of Essex's army, in which presbyterian sentiments prevailed; among others, a brigade quartered in Wiltshire, under the command of major-general Massey, the valiant defender of Gloucester; complaints of all kinds were got up against this body,⁴ and ultimately it was disbanded. In parliament, in the newspapers, in all public places, particularly in the army, the independents only spoke of the Scots with insult, now pointing out to public indignation their rapacity, now ridiculing their parsimony, addressing themselves, by a clumsy but efficacious trick, to national prejudices, to popular distrust, skilful to lose no opportunity of exciting anger and contempt against their enemies.⁵ At last, the commons voted that the Scottish army was no longer required, and that on a hundred thousand pounds being given it on account, and a statement demanded of what more was due, it should be requested to return home (June 11).⁶

These measures had not the effect anticipated; the Scots showed neither vexation nor anger; but their conduct was hesitating, which suited their enemies still better. The perplexity of the leaders inclined to serve the king was extreme. Incurable in his duplicity, because he held himself bound to no engagement with rebellious subjects, Charles meditated their ruin while he was imploring their aid. "I do not despair," he wrote to lord Digby, a few days before he left

¹ Parl. Hist. iii. 460; Whitlocke, 205.

² Whitlocke, 207, *et seq.*

³ Parl. Hist. iii. 474—480.

⁴ Whitlocke, 200, *et seq.* ⁵ Holles, Memoirs, 46. ⁶ Parl. Hist. iii. 484.

Oxford, "of inducing the presbyterians or the independents to join with me in exterminating one the other; and then I shall be king again" (March 26).¹ On their side, the presbyterians, Scots or English, ruled by their ministers, passionately bent upon securing the covenant and the triumph of their church, would not hear of any accommodation with, any assistance to, the king, unless at that price; so that the most moderate, those most anxious for the future, could neither trust in him, nor abate with him any of their claims. In this perplexity, assailed at once by the accusations of their adversaries and the necessities of their party, their words contradicted, their actions neutralized each other; they wished for peace, promised it to the king, were constantly talking with their friends of the dread they had of the independents; and yet never had their declarations of zeal for the covenant, of firm attachment to parliament, of inviolable union with their brethren the English, been more multiplied, more emphatic;² never had they shown themselves so distrustful, so inflexible in reference to the king and the cavaliers. Six of the most illustrious companions of Montrose, taken at the battle of Philip-Haugh, were condemned and executed; a severity for which there was no motive but revenge, and of which, in England, the civil war had presented no example.³ Charles, before quitting Oxford, had written to the marquis of Ormond that he was only proceeding to the Scottish camp on the strength of their promise of supporting him and his just rights if need were (April 3);⁴ and though in all probability their language had not been so explicit as this, it can hardly be doubted that they had in fact given him reason to hope for their support. Ormond published the king's letter (May 21); the Scots at once contradicted it, broadly characterizing it as "a most damnable untruth (June 8)."⁵ More rigour than ever was displayed about the king's person; all who had carried arms in his defence were forbidden to approach him; his letters were in almost every instance intercepted.⁶ At length, to give a signal mark of their fidelity to the cause of the covenant, the Scottish leaders called upon the king to allow himself to be instructed in the

¹ Carte, *Life of Ormond*, iii. 452.

² *Parl. Hist.* iii. 471, 473, 488.

³ Laing, iii. 334.

⁴ Carte, *Life of Ormond*, iii. 455.

⁵ *Parl. Hist.* iii. 480.

⁶ Whitelocks, *passim*.

true doctrine of Christ; and Henderson, the most celebrated preacher of the party, went to Newcastle to undertake officially the conversion of the captive monarch.¹

Charles maintained the controversy with address and dignity, inflexible in his adherence to the Anglican church, but arguing without acrimony against his adversary, who was himself temperate and respectful. During the discussion, the king wrote to the royalist governors who still held out, ordering them to surrender their towns (June 10);² to the parliament, to hasten the transmission of their proposals (June 10);³ to Ormond, to continue his negotiations with the Irish, though at the same time he officially commanded him to break them off;⁴ to Glamorgan, still the only person entrusted with his secret designs, "If you can procure me a large sum of money, by engaging my kingdoms as security, I shall be glad, and as soon as I shall have recovered possession of them, I will fully repay the debt. Tell the nuncio that if I can by any means place myself in his and your hands, I shall certainly not fail to do so, for I see that all the rest condemn me" (July 20).⁵

The proposals of parliament at last arrived (July 23); the earls of Pembroke and Suffolk, and four members of the commons, were charged to present them. One of them, Mr. Goodwin, began to read them: "I beg your pardon," said the king, interrupting him, "have you any power to treat?" "No, sir." "In that case, but for the honour of it, a good, honest trumpeter might have done as much as you." Goodwin finished reading the proposals. "I imagine," said the king, "you do not expect a present answer from me in a business of this consequence." "Sir," replied lord Pembroke, "we have orders to stay no longer than ten days." "Very well," replied Charles, "I will give you an answer in proper time."⁶

Several days passed and the commissioners heard nothing further. The king meanwhile read sadly, and re-read, again and again, these proposals, still more humiliating, still harder

¹ The controversy began on the 29th of May, and lasted till the 16th of July. All the notes which passed between the king and Henderson have been collected in 'The Works of King Charles the Martyr' (1662), 165—187.

² Parl. Hist. iii. 487.

³ Ib. 486.

⁴ Ib. 487: Lingard, vi. 561.

Birch, Inquiry into Glamorgan's Transactions, &c., 245

⁵ Parl. Hist. iii. 513.

than those he had constantly rejected. He was called upon to adopt the covenant, to abolish completely the episcopal church, to surrender to parliament, for twenty years, the command of the army, navy, and militia; and, finally, to consent that his most faithful friends, to the number of seventy-one, excluded by name from any amnesty, that all his party, that whoever had taken arms for him, should be debarred all public employment during the pleasure of parliament.¹ Yet every one persuaded him to accept these terms: M. de Bellièvre, the French ambassador, who had arrived at Newcastle the same day with the parliamentary commissioners, counselled him, in the name of his own court, to do so.² Montreuil brought him letters from the queen, ardently urging compliance;³ on the suggestion of Bellièvre, she even dispatched from Paris a gentleman of her household, sir William Davenant, with orders to tell the king that his resistance was disapproved of by all his friends. "What friends?" said Charles, pettishly. "By lord Jermyn, sir." "Jermyn does not understand anything about the church." "Lord Colepepper is of the same mind." "Colepepper has no religion; is Hyde of this mind?" "We do not know, sir; the chancellor is not at Paris; he has forsaken the prince, and has chosen to remain in Jersey, instead of accompanying the prince to the queen; her majesty is very much offended by his behaviour." "The chancellor is an honest man, who will never forsake me, nor the prince, nor the church; I am sorry he is not with my son; but my wife is mistaken." Davenant urged the point with the vivacity of a poet and the levity of a court gallant; the king grew angry, and drove him roughly from his presence.⁴ On the part of the presbyterians, the entreaties were no less urgent; several towns in Scotland, Edinburgh among others, addressed amicable petitions to the king⁵ on the subject; the city of London wished to do the same, but a formal prohibition from the commons prevented them.⁶ At last, threats were joined to entreaties; the general assembly of the church of Scotland demanded that if the king refused the covenant, he should not be permitted to enter Scotland;⁷ and in a solemn audience, in presence of the

¹ Parl. Hist. iii. 409—512.

² Ib. 512; Clarendon, iii. 47.

³ Whitelocke, 216.

⁴ Clarendon, iii. 48.

⁵ Whitelocke, *ut sup.*

⁶ Ludlow, 79.

⁷ Clarendon, iii. 54.

Scottish commissioners, the chancellor, lord Lowden, declared to him, that if he persisted in his refusal, entrance into Scotland would, in point of fact, be forbidden him, and that in England it was very likely they would depose him, and institute another form of government.¹

The king's pride, his religious scruples, and also some secret hope with which he was still buoyed up by credulous or intriguing friends,² were proof against these presentations. After having from day to day delayed his answer, he, on the 1st of August, sent for the commissioners, and delivered to them a written message, in which, without absolutely rejecting the proposals, he again requested to be received in London to treat personally with parliament.³

The independents could not restrain their joy. On the return of the commissioners, a vote of thanks to them was as usual proposed: "It is the king we should thank," cried a member. "What will become of us now he has refused our proposals?" anxiously inquired a presbyterian. "What would have become of us if he had accepted them?" replied an independent.⁴ A message came from the Scottish commissioners offering to surrender all the places they occupied, and to withdraw their army from England (Aug. 10.).⁵ The lords voted that their brethren the Scots had deserved well of the country; the commons did not join in this vote, but passed a resolution by which it was forbidden to speak ill of the Scots or to print anything against them (Aug. 14).⁶ For a moment, both parties, the one disheartened, the other reassured by the king's refusal, seemed solely engaged in regulating in concert their interests and their discussions.

But truces proclaimed by prudence or spite between adverse passions are of short duration. The offer of the Scots gave rise to two questions: how the arrears which were due to them and which they had been long claiming, were to be settled? and who was to have the disposal of the king's person? These questions once started, both parties renewed the conflict.

On the first point, the presbyterians easily gained the

¹ Rushworth, i. 4, 319. ² Ludlow, 79. ³ Parl. Hist. iii. 513—516.

⁴ Burnet, *Memoirs of the Hamiltons*, 283. ⁵ Parl. Hist. iii. 516.

⁶ *Ib.* This ordinance only passed the commons by a majority of 130 to 102

advantage: the demands of the Scots, it is true, were exorbitant; after giving parliament credit for what it had already paid, they still claimed nearly 700,000*l.*, "without mentioning," they said, "the enormous losses which Scotland had suffered in consequence of her alliance with England, and of which they left the valuation to the equity of parliament."¹ The independents railed with bitter irony against so expensive a fraternity; in their turn, they opposed to the claims of the Scots a detailed account of the sums which had been levied by them, and of their exactions in the north of the kingdom, an account, according to which, Scotland, so far from having anything due to her, was more than 400,000*l.* in debt to England.² But these recriminations could not be admitted or even seriously debated by sensible men; the retirement of the Scots was evidently necessary; the northern counties loudly called for it; to obtain it they must be paid, for a war would be much dearer and far more perilous to parliament. The shuffling pertinacity of the independents seemed merely blind passion or factious manœuvring; the presbyterians, on the contrary, promised to bring the Scots to more moderate terms: all the wavering, distrustful, or reserved, who ranked under the banner of no party, and who several times, from dislike of presbyterian despotism, had given the independents a majority, took on this occasion the side of their adversaries: 400,000*l.* were voted as the maximum concession³ the Scots could hope for, payable, one half on their departure from England, the other half at the expiration of two years. They accepted the bargain, and a loan, on mortgage of church property, was immediately opened in the city, to provide the means of payment (Oct. 13).⁴

But when the question turned on the disposal of the king's person, the position of the presbyterians became very embarrassing. Had they wished him to remain in the hands of the Scots, they could not even have suggested such an idea, for the national pride absolutely repelled it; it was the honour and right, was the universal cry, of the English people alone to dispose of their sovereign; to what jurisdic-

¹ Parl. Hist. *ut sup.*

² *Ib.*

³ In four votes of 100,000*l.* each; the 13th, 21st, and 27th of August, and 1st of September.—Parl. Hist., *ut sup.*

⁴ Rushworth, i. 4, 376; Holles, Memoirs, 66.

tion would the Scots lay claim on English ground. They were nothing there but auxiliaries, paid auxiliaries, who, it was quite obvious, thought of nothing but their pay; let them take their money, then, and return to their own country; England neither wanted nor feared them. The Scots, on their side, however great their desire to avoid a rupture, could not endure patiently all this contumely. Charles, they said, was their king as well as king of England; they had equally with the English, the right to watch over his person and fortunes; the covenant imposed this upon them as a duty. The quarrel became very animated; conferences, pamphlets, declarations, reciprocal accusations multiplied, and grew more vehement day after day; day after day the people, without distinction of party, denounced more and more loudly the pretensions of the Scots, who had altogether fallen in popular opinion; national prejudices and antipathies had reappeared; and the rapacity of the Scots, their narrow-minded prudence, their theological pedantry, daily became more distasteful to the freer, more enlarged, and more liberal minds, the more extended and bolder fanaticism of their allies. The political leaders of the presbyterian party, Holles, Stapleton, Glynn, weary of a struggle in which they found themselves straitened and subordinate, impatiently sought the means of putting an end to it. They persuaded themselves, that if the Scots gave the king into the hands of parliament, it would be easy to disband that fatal army, the only strength of the independents, the true enemy of the parliament and of the king. They therefore counselled the Scots to yield, for the interest of their own cause; and, at the same time, the lords, probably determined by the same influence, at length agreed (Sept. 24) to this resolution of the commons which had been five months in suspense: "That to the parliament alone belongs the right of disposing of the king's person."¹

The Scottish presbyterians, most of them at least, were quite willing to believe in the wisdom of this counsel, and to follow it, embarrassed as they were by their own resistance, and not knowing how to maintain it nor how to give it up.

¹ Rushworth, i. 4, 329—372; Holles, Memoirs, 68; Baillie, ii. 257; Laing, iii. 369.

But the king's friends among the party had lately acquired rather more boldness and power. The duke of Hamilton was at their head, after an imprisonment of three years at St. Michael's Mount, in Cornwall, whither he had been sent in consequence of the distrust which his wavering conduct had inspired at the court of Oxford, and in the mind of the king himself. He had quitted the place when it fell into the hands of the parliament, and after passing a few days in London, and paying cordial visits to the members of both houses, he had proceeded to Newcastle, where Charles had just arrived with the Scottish army, had soon regained his former favour with the king, and on his return to Edinburgh had made the most earnest efforts for his safety.¹ Around him immediately rallied nearly all the higher nobility of the kingdom, the citizens, the moderate presbyterians; the prudent, who were disgusted with the blind fanaticism of the multitude and the insolent domination of its ministers; the honest and timid, who were willing to make any sacrifice to obtain a little rest. These effected the appointment of a new and solemn deputation, who went to Newcastle, and conjured the king, on their knees, to accept the proposals of parliament. The passionate entreaties of these deputies, all of them his fellow-countrymen, nearly all of them the companions of his youth, shook Charles's resolution: "Upon my word," he said to them, "all the dangers and inconveniences laid before me do not so much trouble me, as that I should not give full satisfaction to the desires of my native country, especially being so earnestly pressed upon me. I desire to be rightly understood: I am far from giving you a negative—nay, I protest against it, my only wish being to be heard, and hope you will press those at London to hear reason. If a king were to refuse this to any of his subjects, he would be thought a tyrant."² The next day, possibly after fresh solicitations, he offered to limit the establishment of the episcopal church to five dioceses,³ allowing the presbyterian system to prevail in the rest of the kingdom, claiming only for himself and his friends of the same persuasion, the free exercise of their own

¹ Clarendon, iii. 152; Rushworth, i. 4, 327.

² Rushworth, i. 4, 327.

³ Those of Oxford, Winchester, Bristol, Bath and Wells, and Exeter.

conscience and worship, until, in conjunction with the parliament, he should put an end to all their differences. But no partial concession satisfied the presbyterians; and the higher offers the king made, the more they doubted his sincerity. His proposal was scarcely listened to. Hamilton, discouraged, talked of retiring to the continent; a report at the same time was spread, that the Scottish army was about to enter Scotland. The king immediately wrote to the duke (Sept. 26): "Hamilton, I have so much to write, and so little time for it, that this letter will be suitable to the times, without method or reason.—Those at London think to get me into their hands by telling our countrymen that they do not intend to make me a prisoner. O no, by no means!—but only to give me an honourable guard forsooth, to attend me continually, for the security of my person. Wherefore I must then tell you (and 'tis so far from a secret that I desire every one should know it), that I will not be left in England when this army retires, unless clearly, and according to the old way of understanding, I may remain a free man, and that no attendant be forced upon me upon any pretence whatsoever. By going, you take away from me the means of showing myself;" and he finished his letter with these words: "Your most assured, real, faithful, constant friend."¹ Hamilton remained; the Scottish parliament met (November): its first sittings seemed to announce a firm and active good-will towards the king. It declared (Dec. 16) that it would maintain monarchical government in the person and descendants of his majesty, as well as his just right to the crown of England; and that secret instructions should be sent to the Scottish commissioners in London, to negotiate that the king might go thither with honour, safety, and liberty. But next day the permanent committee of the general assembly of the presbyterian church addressed a public remonstrance to the Scottish parliament, accusing it of listening to perfidious counsels, and complaining that it put the union of the two kingdoms, the only hope of the faithful, in peril, merely to serve a prince obstinate in rejecting the covenant of Christ.² Against such intervention, Hamilton and his friends were powerless. The docile parliament retracted its vote of the pre-

¹ Rushworth, i. 4, 327—329² Ib. 380; Laing, iii. 364—368.

ceding day; and the moderate men could effect nothing beyond a fresh message to the king, entreating him to accept the proposals. Charles only answered by another message, requesting to treat in person with parliament.¹

At the very moment that, for the fifth time, he was expressing this unavailing wish, parliament was signing the treaty regulating the retirement of the Scottish army, and the mode of paying it (Dec. 28).² The loan opened in the city had been immediately filled; on the 16th of December, the 200,000*l.* which the Scots were to receive previous to their departure, enclosed in two hundred cases, sealed with the seal of the two nations, and conveyed in thirty-six carts,³ left London, escorted by a body of infantry; and Skippon, who commanded it, issued an order of the day that any officer or soldier who by word or deed or otherwise, should give any Scottish officer or soldier subject of complaint, should forthwith be severely punished.⁴ The convoy entered York on the 1st of January, 1647, the cannon of the town celebrating its arrival;⁵ and three weeks after, the Scots received their first payment at Northallerton. The king's name was not mentioned in the course of this negotiation; but a week after the treaty had been signed (Dec. 31),⁶ the two houses voted that he should be conveyed to Holmby Castle in Northamptonshire; and he so undoubtedly formed part of the bargain, that the commons discussed the question whether commissioners should be sent to Newcastle to receive him solemnly from the Scots, or whether they should merely require him to be given up without any ceremony to Skippon, with the keys of the place and the receipt for the money. The independents strongly insisted upon the last mode, delighted with the idea of insulting at the same time the king and their rivals. But the presbyterians succeeded in rejecting it (Jan. 6, 1647);⁷ and on the 12th of January, nine commissioners, three lords and six members of the commons,⁸ left London with a nu-

¹ Rushworth, i. 4, 393.

² Parl. Hist. iii. 532—536.

³ Rushworth, i. 4, 389; Parl. Hist. iii. 538.

⁴ Whitelocke, 230.

⁵ Parl. Hist. *ut sup.*; Drake, History of York (1736), 171.

⁶ Parl. Hist. 538.

⁷ *Ib.*

⁸ The earls of Pembroke and Denbigh, lord Montague, sir John Coke, sir Walter Earl, sir John Holland, sir James Harrington, Mr. Carew, and major-general Brown.

merous suite, to go and respectfully take possession of their sovereign.¹

Charles was playing at chess when he received the first intimation of the vote of parliament and of his approaching removal to Holmby Castle; he quietly finished his game, and merely observed that on the arrival of the commissioners he would acquaint them with his will (Jan. 15).² Those about him manifested more anxiety; his friends and servants looked around on all sides for some aid, some refuge, now meditating another flight, now attempting in some corner of the kingdom to excite a fresh rising of the royalists in his favour.³ Even the people began to show themselves touched by his fate. A Scottish minister, preaching before him at Newcastle, gave out the 52d Psalm, beginning with these words:

"Why dost thou, tyrant, boast thyself
Thy wicked works to praise?"

The king arose, and instead of this, began the 56th Psalm:

"Have mercy, Lord, on me I pray,
For men would me devour:"

and with a common impulse, the whole assembly joined with him:⁴ but the pity of a people is tardy, and remains long without effect.

The commissioners arrived at Newcastle (Jan. 22); the Scottish parliament had officially consented to surrender the king (Jan. 16).⁵ "I am sold and bought," said he, when he heard of it. Yet he received the commissioners well, talked cheerfully with them, congratulated lord Pembroke upon having been able at his age, and in so severe a season, to make so long a journey without fatigue, inquired the state of the roads, appeared, in short, anxious for them to think him glad to return to the parliament.⁶ Before quitting him, the Scottish commissioners, lord Lauderdale in particular, the most clear-sighted of all, made a last attempt with him in favour of the covenant: "If he would but adopt it," they said, "instead of giving him up to the English, we will take

¹ Sir Thomas Herbert, *Memoirs* (1702), 7.

² Burnet's *Memoirs of the Hamiltons*, 307.

³ *Parl. Hist. ut sup.*

⁴ Whitelocke, 280.

⁵ *Parl. Hist.* iii. 541.

⁶ Herbert, 8.

him to Berwick, and obtain reasonable conditions for him." They even offered Montreuil, who still served as a mediator between them, a large sum of money if he could only obtain a promise from the king.¹ Charles persisted in his refusal, but without complaining of the conduct of the Scots towards him, treating the commissioners of both nations with equal civility, evidently anxious to avoid exhibiting either distrust or anger.² The Scots, wearied out, at length took their departure; Newcastle was given up to the English troops (Jan. 30); and the king left it on the 9th of February, escorted by a regiment of horse. He travelled slowly; all the way an eager crowd flocked to meet him; persons afflicted with the king's evil were brought to him and placed round his carriage, or at the door of the house which he occupied, that he might touch them as he passed. The commissioners were alarmed, and forbade this concourse,³ but to little purpose, for no one was yet accustomed to oppress or to fear, and the soldiers themselves dared not drive back the people too roughly.⁴ Approaching Nottingham, Fairfax, whose head-quarters were there, came out to meet the king, alighted as soon as he saw him, kissed his hand, and mounting his horse again, went through the town by his side in respectful conversation. "The general is a man of honour," said the king, when he left him, "he has kept his word with me;"⁵ and two days after (Feb. 16) when he entered Holmby, where a great many gentlemen and others of the neighbourhood had met to celebrate his arrival, he highly congratulated himself on the reception he had received from his subjects.⁶

At Westminster even, the presbyterians conceived some disquietude at all this, but it soon gave way to the joy of finding themselves masters of the king, and free at length boldly to attack their enemies. Charles arrived at Holmby on the 16th of February; and on the 19th the commons had already voted that the army should be disbanded, excepting

¹ Thurloe, State Papers, i. 87; Letter of M. de Montreuil to M. de Brionne, February 2, 1647.

² *Ib.*

³ By a declaration published at Leeds, February 9, 1647; *Parl. Hist.* iii. 549.

⁴ Herbert, 10.

⁵ Whitelocke, 238. It is not known to what promise Charles alluded; perhaps to that of receiving him and talking with him as Fairfax did.

⁶ Herbert, 10.

such part of it as might be required for the Irish war, the service of the garrisons and the police of the kingdom.¹ Fairfax himself was near being deprived of the command of the troops retained;² and, though he was left in possession of it, it was decreed, that no member of the house could serve with him, that he should have under his command no officer above the rank of colonel, and that they should all be bound to conform to the presbyterian church, and to adopt the covenant.³ On their side, the lords, to relieve, as they said, the counties round London, the most devoted of all to the public cause, required that the army, pending its dismissal, should take up its quarters at a greater distance from the metropolis (March 24.)⁴ A loan of 200,000*l.*, was opened in the city to pay the disbanded troops a portion of their arrears.⁵ Finally, a special committee, on which sat nearly all the presbyterian leaders, Holles, Stapleton, Glynn, Maynard, Waller, was ordered to superintend the execution of these measures, and in particular to hasten the departure of those succours which the unfortunate Irish protestants had so long been expecting.⁶

The attack was not unforeseen: for the last two months the independents had felt their influence decline in the house, for most of the new members, who at first had acted with them, from a dread of presbyterian despotism, were beginning to turn against them.⁷ "What misery," said Cromwell one day to Ludlow, "to serve a parliament! let a man be ever so true; if a lawyer calumniate him he can never recover it; whereas, in serving under a general, one is as useful, and there is neither blame nor envy to dread; if thy father were alive he would soon let some of them hear what they deserve."⁸ A sincere republican, and as yet a stranger to the intrigues of his party, though he fully shared their passions, Ludlow did not understand his friend's meaning, and did not meet his advances; but others were more easily deceived and seduced. Cromwell had already, in the army, several able accomplices and blind instruments; Ireton, who shortly after became his son-in-law, a man bred to the law, but now commissary-

¹ Parl. Hist. iii. 558. This motion was adopted by 150 to 147.

² The motion was rejected by a majority of only 12, 150 to 147.—Parl. Hist. *ut sup.* ³ This motion was adopted by 136 to 108.—Id. ib.

⁴ Id. ib. ⁵ Rushworth, i. 4, 449. ⁶ Holles, Mem. 75; Rushworth, *ut sup.*

⁷ Id. ib.

⁸ Ludlow, 79.

general of the cavalry, of a firm, obstinate, and subtle spirit, capable of carrying on silently, and with deep cunning, the boldest designs, veiled under an appearance of rough honesty; Lambert, one of the most brilliant officers of the army, ambitious, vain, and who, like Ireton, brought up to the law, had retained of his studies a power of insinuation, a readiness of speech, which he liked to make use of with the soldiers; Harrison, Hammond, Pride, Rich, Rainsborough, all of them colonels of tried valour, popular, and personally attached to him: Harrison, because in pious meetings they had sought the Lord together; Hammond, because he was indebted to him for his marriage with a daughter of Hampden;¹ the others, because they felt the ascendancy of his genius, or expected their rise with his, or simply obeyed him as soldiers. By their means, Cromwell, though, the war being over, he had resumed his seat at Westminster, maintained all his influence in the army, and from a distance exercised there his indefatigable activity. As soon as the disbanding of the troops was talked of, these men in particular were loud in their murmurs; it was to them that, from London, news, insinuations, suggestions were sent, which they immediately circulated underhand throughout the army, exhorting the soldiers to insist upon the payment of the whole of their arrears, to refuse to serve in Ireland, to avoid disunion among themselves. Cromwell, meanwhile, to disarm suspicion apparently inactive, was constantly deploring from his place in the house the discontent of the army, and pouring forth protestations of his devotion to parliament.²

First came a petition signed only by fourteen officers (March 25),³ written in a humble and conciliatory tone. They promised to go to Ireland at the first orders, and contented themselves for the present with offering modest counsel as to the payment of arrears and the guarantees that the troops had a right to expect. The house thanked them, but haughtily, intimating that it became none to direct parliament what to do.⁴ As soon as this answer reached the army, another petition was instantly prepared, far more firm and definite than the first. It demanded that the arrears should be strictly liquidated; that no one should be

¹ Clarendon, iii. 118.

² Parl. Hist. iii. 560

³ Holles, Memoirs, 84.

⁴ Ib. iii. 502.

obliged to go to Ireland against his will; that disabled soldiers and the widows and children of soldiers should receive pensions; that prompt payments on account might relieve the troops from becoming a burden on the people among whom they were quartered. It was no longer by a few individuals, but in the name of the whole body of officers and soldiers, that the petition was drawn up; and it was addressed, not to parliament, but to Fairfax, the natural representative of the army and guardian of its rights. It was read at the head of each regiment, and such officers as refused to sign it were threatened.¹

Upon the first intelligence of these proceedings, parliament commanded Fairfax to prohibit them, declaring that whoever should persist in them would be considered an enemy of the state and disturber of the public peace; it further required certain of the officers to attend the house and explain their conduct.²

Fairfax promised obedience: Hammond, Pride, Lilburne, and Grimes went to Westminster (April 1), and loudly repelled the charges brought against them: "It is not true," said Pride, "that the petition was read at the head of each regiment;" it was at the head of each company that it had been read; the house did not press the matter further—it was sufficient, they said, that the petition was abandoned and disavowed.³

The preparations for disbanding the army were resumed: the loan opened in the city went on slowly, and was not enough; a general tax of 60,000*l.* a-month was imposed to make up the amount.⁴ Above all, the formation of the corps destined for Ireland was hastened; great advantages were promised to those who would enlist in them; and Skippen and Massey were appointed to command them.⁵ Five commissioners, all of the presbyterian party, proceeded to headquarters to make these resolutions known.

¹ Parl. Hist. iii. 562—567; Whitelocke, 241.

² This declaration was made on the 30th of March, 1647; Parl. Hist. ii. 567.

³ Rushworth, i. 4, 444.

⁴ The ordinance, proposed in the beginning of April, was not definitively adopted till the 23rd of June following. (Rushworth, i. 4, 592.) The tax was voted for one year.

⁵ Rushworth, i. 4, 452.

On the day of their arrival (April 15), two hundred officers, assembled in the house of Fairfax, entered into conference with them: "Who will command us in Ireland?" asked Lambert. "Major-general Skippon and major-general Massey are appointed." "The great part of the army," replied Hammond, "will readily follow major-general Skippon, which otherwise they would not; they know the worth and valour of that great soldier; but they must also have the general officers of whom they have had such experience." "Yes, yes," cried the officers; "give us Fairfax and Cromwell, and we will go." The commissioners, quite disconcerted, left the room, requesting that all the well-disposed would come to them at their lodgings. Scarcely more than twelve or fifteen accepted the invitation.¹

A few days after (April 27),² a hundred and forty-one officers addressed a solemn justification of their conduct to parliament: "We hope, by being soldiers," they said, "we have not lost the capacity of subjects, nor divested ourselves thereby of our interests in the commonwealth; that in purchasing the freedom of our brethren, we have not lost our own. For our liberty of petitioning, we hope the house will never deny it to us, as it has not denied it to its enemies, but justified and commended it, and received misrepresentations of us. The false suggestions of some men have informed you that the army intended to enslave the kingdom: we earnestly implore your justice to vindicate us, and that our hard-earned wages may be cared for, according to our great necessities, more especially those of the soldiers."

The house had scarcely finished reading this letter (April 30), when Skippon rose, and delivered another, which had been brought to him the day before by three private soldiers. In it eight regiments of horse expressly refused to serve in Ireland. It was, they said, a perfidious design upon them and many of the godly party, a pretext to separate the soldiers from the officers they loved, and to conceal the ambition of a few men who had long been servants, but who having lately tasted of sovereign power, were now, in order to remain masters, degenerating into tyrants. At this per-

¹ Rushworth, i. 4, 457; Whitelocks, 244.

² Parl. Hist. iii. 568; Rushworth, i. 4, 469—472.

sonal attack, the presbyterian leaders, alike astonished and irritated, demanded that the house, laying aside all other business, should summon before it and question the three soldiers. They came; their demeanour was firm, their deportment unembarrassed.¹ "Where was this letter got up?" inquired the speaker. "At a meeting of the regiments." "Who wrote it?" "A council of delegates appointed by each regiment." "Did your officers approve of it?" "Very few of them know anything about it." "Do you know that none but royalists could have suggested such a proceeding? You yourselves, were you ever cavaliers?" "We entered the service of parliament before the battle of Edge-hill, and have remained in it ever since." One of the three stepped forward: "I received, on one occasion, five wounds; I had fallen; major-general Skippon saw me on the ground; he gave me five shillings to get relief; the major-general can contradict me if I lie." "It is true," said Skippon, looking with interest at the soldier. "But what means this sentence in which you speak about sovereign power?" "We are only the agents of our regiments; if the house will give us its questions in writing, we will take them to the regiments and bring back the answers."

A violent tumult arose in the house; the presbyterians broke out into threats. Cromwell, leaning towards Ludlow, who was sitting next to him, said, "These men will never leave, till the army pull them out by the ears."²

Anger soon gave way to uneasiness; the discovery just made was an alarming one; it was no longer discontented soldiers whom they had to repress; the whole army was banded together, was erecting itself into an independent, perhaps rival power, had already its own government. Two councils, composed the one of officers, the other of delegates or *agitators*, named by the soldiers, regulated all its proceedings, and were preparing to negotiate in its name. Every precaution had been taken to keep up this growing organization; every squadron, every company named two agitators; whenever it was necessary for them to meet, every soldier gave fourpence to defray the expenses, and the two councils

¹ Their names were Edward Sexby, William Allen, and Thomas Sheppard.

² Rushworth, i. 4, 474; Holles, Memoirs, 89; Whitelocke, 219.

³ Ludlow, 81.

were never to act but in common.¹ At the same time, a report was spread, and not without foundation, that proposals had reached the king from the army; it was said that it offered to re-establish him in his just rights,² if he would place himself at its head and under its care. In parliament itself, at the manifestation of this new power, and dreading its immediate strength still more than its triumph, the more cautious members became timid; some left London; others, like Whitelocke, sought the favour of the generals, of Cromwell in particular, who eagerly met their advances.³ It was resolved to try the effect of compliance, and to treat with the army through its own leaders. Two months' pay, instead of six weeks', as first voted, was promised to the troops who were to be disbanded (May 14);⁴ an ordinance was drawn up for a general amnesty for all disorders and illegal acts committed during the war;⁵ and funds were assigned to assist the widows and children of soldiers.⁶ Finally, Cromwell, Ireton, Skippon, Fleetwood, all the generals who were members of the commons, and who were acceptable to the army, were charged to re-establish harmony between it and the parliament.⁷

A fortnight passed without their presence at head-quarters appearing to produce any effect. They wrote often, but their letters contained nothing: sometimes the council of officers had refused to answer without the concurrence of the agitators; sometimes the agitators themselves had requested time to consult the soldiers.⁸ Every day, and under the eyes of the commissioners of parliament, this hostile government acquired more consistency and power. Yet Cromwell ceased not to write that he was exhausting himself in futile efforts to appease the army, that his own influence was greatly suffering in consequence, and that he him-

¹ Rushworth, i. 4, 485; Fairfax, 106; Holles, *ut sup.*; Ludlow, *ut sup.*

² Proposals of this nature had in fact been made to the king by some officers in the beginning of April; Charles rejected them.—Clarendon, *State Papers*, ii. 366.

³ Whitelocke, 248.

⁴ Rushworth, i. 4, 484.

⁵ *Ib.* The ordinance was definitively adopted on the 21st of May—*Ibid.* 489.

⁶ Holles, 91.

⁷ They went to the head-quarters at Saffron Walden, in Essex, on the 7th of May, 1647.

⁸ Rushworth, i. 4, 490, 485, 487; Huntingdon, *Memoirs* (1702), 152.

self should soon become an object of suspicion and odium to the soldiers.¹ Some of the commissioners at length returned to London, bringing from the army the same proposals on the one hand, the same refusals on the other.²

The presbyterian leaders had expected this; and, profiting by the disposition of the house, which had hoped for better things, obtained in a few hours the adoption of more decided resolutions. On a motion of Holles, it was voted that the troops which would not enlist for Ireland, should be instantly disbanded; all the details of this measure were arranged, the day, the place, the means. The corps were to be dissolved suddenly, separately, each in its quarters, almost at the same time, or at very short intervals, so that they might neither concert nor assemble together. The money necessary to carry out the first acts of the operation was forwarded to different points, and commissioners, all of them presbyterians, were sent to superintend its execution.³

They found the army in the most violent confusion: informed of the blow which threatened them, most of the regiments had mutinied; some, expelling such officers as they distrusted, had of their own authority put themselves in motion, with colours flying, to join their comrades; others had entrenched themselves, armed and equipped, in churches, declaring that they would not disperse; some had seized the money destined to pay the disbanded troops; all clamorously demanded a general meeting, in which the whole army might be heard; and a letter was immediately addressed to Fairfax (May 29) in the name of the soldiers, saying, that if their officers refused to lead them, they well knew how to meet without them, and defend their own rights. Fairfax disconcerted, afflicted; exhorted the officers, hearkened to the soldiers, wrote to parliament, alike sincere and alike uninfluential with all parties, equally incapable of resigning popularity or exercising power. At last he called a council of war (May 26), and the officers, with only six exceptions, voted that the resolutions of parliament were not satisfactory, that the army could not disperse without better securities, that it

¹ Clarendon, iii. 357, &c.

² Rushworth, i. 4, 491.

³ Rushworth, i. 4, 493, 494, 496; Parl. Hist. iii. 582; Holles, *Memoirs*, 136. These resolutions were adopted by the house of lords on May 22, 1647.

should draw its quarters nearer together; that a general meeting should take place to calm the fears of the soldiers; and that a humble representation from the council should inform the parliament of all that had taken place.¹

No illusion was longer possible; its authority thus braved, parliament could no longer suffice to itself; it required against such enemies some other strength than its name, some other support than the law. This could only be given it by the king, on one hand, or by the city, still altogether presbyterian, and very near becoming royalist, on the other. Some measures had already been taken with this view; by the consent of the common council, the command of the militia had been taken from the independents and transferred to a committee of presbyterians;² a more numerous guard had been placed round the doors of parliament;³ 12,000*l.* additional had been assigned for their maintenance; crowds of the cashiered officers, the faithful remnant of Essex's army, sojourned freely in the city. To the great regret of the party, Essex himself was no more; he had died almost suddenly, at the latter end of the preceding year (Sept. 14), on his return from a hunting party, just at the time when it was said he was preparing to make a signal effort in favour of peace; and his death had seemed to the presbyterians so terrible a blow that a rumour was spread of his having been poisoned by his enemies. But Waller, Poyntz, Massey were full of zeal, and all ready to declare themselves. As to the king, parliament might very well fear that he did not entertain towards them a feeling much more favourable than before: twice, with the hard bigotry of theological hatred, they had refused him the attendance of his chaplains (Feb. 19 and March 8); and two presbyterian ministers, Messrs. Marshall and Caryll, solemnly celebrated their own form of worship, at Holmby, though Charles constantly refused to attend;⁴ his most trusty servants had been removed from him;⁵ every attempt to correspond with his wife, his children, or his friends, was strictly prevented;⁶ it was with great difficulty

¹ Rushworth, i. 4, 400; Parl. Hist. iii. 585; Holles, 126.

² By an ordinance of the 4th of May, 1647; Rushworth, i. 4, 472, 478.

³ *Ib.* 496.

⁴ Parl. Hist. iii. 557—559; Herbert, 11.

⁵ *Ib.* 18.

⁶ Rushworth, i. 4, 453, 482.

that one of the commissioners of the Scottish parliament, lord Dumferline, obtained permission to converse with him (May 13);¹ finally, he had (May 12)² addressed to parliament a detailed answer on the proposal he had received at Newcastle, and more than a fortnight had elapsed without any disposition being manifested to take it into consideration. After so much and such vexatious rigour, a reconciliation seemed difficult. Yet the necessity of the case was urgent; if the king had reason to complain of the presbyterians, he still knew that they did not desire his utter ruin. Even at Holmby, though so strictly watched, the usual honours of royalty were observed towards him; his household was maintained with splendour, the ceremonies of the court exactly adhered to; on the part of the resident commissioners, who were all presbyterians, nothing in their deportment was wanting in etiquette and respect, and they accordingly lived upon very good terms together; sometimes the king invited them to accompany him in his walks, sometimes he played at chess or at bowls with them, always treating them with marked attention, and seeking their society.³ Assuredly, they thought, he could not be ignorant that the enemies of parliament were also his own, nor refuse the only means of safety that was now offered him. The lords voted (May 20)⁴ that his majesty should be invited to reside near London, in Oatlands Castle; the commons, without joining in the vote, manifested the same wish; the correspondence with the resident commissioners, particularly with colonel Greaves, the commandant of the garrison, became active and mysterious: already at Westminster and in the city, every one was indulging in the hope that the king would soon unite with his parliament, when, on the 4th of June, the news arrived that the day before the king had been taken from Holmby by a detachment of seven hundred men, and was now in the hands of the army.

And so it was, on the 2nd of June, as the king was playing at bowls, after dinner, on Althorpe Down, two miles from Holmby, the commissioners who accompanied him remarked with astonishment, among those standing by, a stranger in the uniform of Fairfax's regiment of guards. Colonel

¹ Rushworth, i. 4, 483.

² Herbert, 12.

³ Parl Hist. iii. 577—581.

⁴ Parl. Hist. iii. 581.

Greaves asked him who he was, whence he came, what was talked of in the army; the man answered somewhat abruptly and haughtily, as if conscious of his own importance, yet without impertinence. Soon afterwards, a report circulated round the king that a numerous body of horse was approaching Holmby: "Did you hear of them?" said Greaves to the stranger. "I did more than hear, I saw them yesterday not thirty miles off." This caused great alarm; all immediately returned to Holmby; some preparations were made to resist an attack; the garrison promised to remain faithful to the parliament. Towards midnight, a body of horse arrived under the walls of the castle, and demanded entrance. "Who is your commander?" inquired the commissioners. "We all command," was the reply. One of them came forward, the same who had been seen a few hours before on Althorpe Down: "My name is Joyce," said he; "I am a cornet in the general's guard; I want to speak to the king." "From whom?" "From myself." The commissioners laughed. "It's no laughing matter," said Joyce; "I come not hither to be advised by you; I have no business with the commissioners; my errand is to the king, and speak with him I must and will presently." Greaves and major-general Brown, one of the commissioners, ordered the garrison to hold themselves in readiness to fire; but the soldiers had talked with the newcomers, the portcullis was lowered, the gates opened, and Joyce's men were already in the castle-yard, alighting from their horses, shaking hands with their comrades, saying they were come by order of the army to place the king in safety, as there was a plot to carry him off, take him to London, raise other troops, and begin a second civil war; and colonel Greaves, commandant of the garrison, they added, had engaged to accomplish the treachery. On hearing this, the soldiers exclaimed that they would not forsake the army; Greaves disappeared, and made his escape in all haste. After a few hours' conference, the commissioners saw that all hope of resistance must be given up. It was noon; Joyce took possession of the castle, posted sentinels about it, and then retired till evening to give his men some repose.

He returned at ten, and requested to be taken to the king. "The king is in bed," was the answer. "I don't care," said he, "I have waited long enough; I must see

him;" and, with a cocked pistol in his hand, he caused himself to be conducted to the apartment occupied by Charles. "I am sorry," said he, to the gentlemen in attendance, "to disturb the rest of his majesty; but I cannot help it; I must needs speak with him, and that at once." He was asked whether he was authorized by the commissioners. "No; I have put guards at their doors, and my orders come from men who do not fear them." They urged him to lay aside his arms, but he absolutely refused. Some hesitation was shown to open the door; he grew angry. The king, awakened by the quarrel, rang, and gave orders that he should be admitted. Joyce entered, uncovered, but his pistol still in his hand, and with a determined though not insulting air. The king, in the presence of the commissioners, whom he sent for, had a long conference with him, and then dismissed him, saying: "Good night, Mr. Joyce; I will readily go with you, if your soldiers confirm all you have promised me."

Next morning, at six, Joyce's men were drawn up on horseback in the castle yard. The king appeared at the top of the stairs, followed by the commissioners and his servants. Joyce came forward. "Mr. Joyce," said the king, "I must ask you, by what authority you pretend to seize me and take me from this place?" "Sir, I am sent by authority of the army, to prevent the designs of its enemies, who would once more plunge the kingdom in blood." "This is no legal authority; I acknowledge no other in England than my own, and after mine, that of the parliament. Have you a written warrant from sir Thomas Fairfax?" "I have orders from the army, and the general is comprised in the army." "That is no answer; the general is at the head of the army; have you a written warrant?" "I beg that your majesty will question me no further; I have already said enough." "Come, Mr. Joyce, be frank with me; tell me where is your commission?" "There it is, sir." "Where?" "There." "But where?" "There, behind me," and he pointed to his soldiers. "Believe me," said the king, smiling, "your instructions are written in very legible characters; 'tis truly a fair commission; you have a company of as handsome, proper gentlemen as I have seen a great while. But you must know that, to take me hence, you must employ force, if you do not promise I shall be treated with respect, and that nothing shall be required of

me against my conscience or my honour." "Nothing! nothing!" exclaimed all the soldiers. "We should be most unwilling," said Joyce, "to force men to act against their conscience, much less your majesty." "Now, gentlemen, for the place you intend to have me to?" "To Oxford, sir, if you please." "No, the air is not good." "Then to Cambridge." "No, I would rather go to Newmarket; it is an air that always agreed with me." "As you please, sir." As the king was retiring, the commissioners advanced a few steps towards the troop: "Gentlemen," said lord Montague, "we are here in trust from both houses, and desire to know whether you all agree to what Mr. Joyce has said?" "All, all!" "Let those," said major-general Brown, "who wish the king should remain with us, say so." "None, none!" was the reply. Their powerlessness thus manifested, the commissioners submitted; three of them got into the carriage with the king, the others mounted their horses, and Joyce gave the word to march.¹

A messenger was dispatched at the same moment to London, bearing a letter in which Joyce announced to Cromwell that all had succeeded. If he did not find Cromwell in London, the messenger was to deliver the letter to sir Arthur Haslerig, and, in his absence, to colonel Fleetwood. It was Fleetwood who received it;² Cromwell was at head-quarters, with Fairfax, who was greatly troubled when he heard what had taken place. "I do not like it," he said to Ireton; "who gave such orders?" "I ordered," replied Ireton, "that the king should be secured at Holmby, but not that he should be carried away." "It was quite necessary," said Cromwell, who at that moment arrived from London, "or the king would have been taken, and had back to parliament." Fairfax at once sent colonel Whalley with two regiments of horse to meet the king, and take him back to Holmby; Charles refused to return, protesting against the violence to which he had been subjected, but, in reality, well pleased to change his prison, and that discord prevailed among his enemies. Two days after, Fairfax himself, and all his staff, Cromwell, Ireton, Skippon, Hammond, Lambert, and Rich,

¹ Rushworth, i. 4, 502, 513—515; *Parl. Hist.* iii. 588—601; Herbert, 17—24; Ludlow, 82.

² Holles, *Memoirs*, 97; Huntingdon, *Memoirs*, 312.

presented themselves to him (June 7) at Childersley, near Cambridge. Most of them, Fairfax being the first, respectfully kissed his hand; Cromwell and Ireton alone kept apart. Fairfax protested to the king that he had known nothing about his removal. "I will not believe it," said Charles, "unless you have Joyce forthwith hanged."¹ Joyce was summoned: "I told the king," said he, "that I had no warrant from the general; I acted by order of the army; let the army be assembled; if three parts of them do not approve of what I have done, I consent to be hanged at the head of my regiment." Fairfax talked of having him tried by a court-martial, but to no purpose. "Sir," said the king to him, when he left him, "I have as good interest in the army as you;" and he desired to be taken back to Newmarket. Colonel Whalley here took up his quarters with him; Fairfax returned to head-quarters, and Cromwell to Westminster, where, for the last four days, all had been wondering at his absence.²

He found both houses a prey to sudden alternations of anger and fear, decision and weakness. The first news that the king was carried off caused general dismay; Skippon, whom the presbyterians persisted in regarding as one of their party, moved, in a lamentable tone, that a solemn fast should be ordained, to obtain from the Lord the restoration of harmony between the parliament and the army; and meanwhile it was voted, on the one hand, that a considerable sum on account of arrears should be advanced forthwith, and, on the other, that the declaration which had treated the first petition from the officers as seditious, should be rescinded and erased from the Journals (June 5).³ Further information, however, by exciting indignation, restored some degree of courage to the parliament; they received from the commissioners details of what had taken place at Holmby; they became acquainted with the letter from Joyce to Cromwell; they even thought they knew exactly on what day, at head-quarters, in a conference between some officers and the principal agitators, this audacious coup-de-main⁴ had been

¹ Huntingdon, *Memoirs*, 153.

² Rushworth, i. 4, 545, 549; Herbert, 25; Warwick (1701), 299; Fairfax, 116.

³ Parl. Hist. iii. 592, 597; Holles, *Memoirs*, 132.

⁴ According to Holles, 90, it was on the 30th of May.

planned and decided upon at Cromwell's instigation. When the lieutenant-general reappeared in the house, their suspicions were given utterance to; he repelled them with vehemence, calling God, angels, men to witness, that up to that day Joyce was as unknown to him as the light of the sun to the unborn child.¹ None the less for that, the conviction of Holles, Glynn, and Grimstone, remained unshaken, and they sought everywhere for proofs, resolved to take the first opportunity of moving his arrest. One morning, a little before the house met, two officers waited upon Grimstone. "Not long since," said they, "was discussed, in an assembly of officers, whether it would not be well to purge the army, so as to have there only men in whom confidence could be placed: 'I am sure of the army,' Cromwell said, on the occasion, 'but there is another body which it is far more urgent to purge, the house of commons—and the army alone can do this.'" "Will you repeat these words to the house?" asked Grimstone. "We are ready to do so," answered the officers; and they accompanied him to Westminster. The house was sitting; a debate was begun: "Mr. Speaker," said Grimstone, as soon as he entered, "I move that this debate be adjourned; I have a much more urgent matter to put to it, a far graver question, a question affecting our liberty, our very existence;" and he forthwith charged Cromwell, who was present, with intending to employ the army against the parliament. "My witnesses are here," he said; "I move that they be admitted." The two officers came, and repeated their statement. They were no sooner withdrawn than Cromwell arose, and, falling on his knees, after a passion of tears, with a vehemence of sobs, words, and gestures that filled the whole assembly with emotion or astonishment, poured forth invocations and fervent prayers, invoking upon his head every curse of God, if any man in the kingdom was more faithful than he to the house. Then, rising, he spoke for more than two hours of the king, the army, of his enemies, of his friends, of himself; touching upon and mixing up all things; humble and audacious, verbose and impassioned, earnestly repeating, again and again, that he was unjustly assailed, compromised without reason; that, with the excep-

¹ Harris, *Life of Cromwell*, 97, in the note.

tion of a few men whose eyes were turned towards the land of Egypt, officers and soldiers, all were devoted to him, and easy to keep under his command. In a word, such was his success, that when he sat down, the ascendancy had altogether gone over to his party, and, "if he had pleased," as Grimstone himself said, thirty years afterwards, "the house would have sent us to the Tower, me and my officers, as calumniators."¹

But Cromwell was too wise to be eager for revenge, too clear-sighted to deceive himself respecting the real value of his triumph. He immediately saw that such scenes could not be repeated, and the very same evening secretly left London, joined the army assembled at Triploe Heath (June 10),² near Cambridge; and laying aside towards the presbyterians and the house that disguise which he felt could no longer be maintained, even with his hypocrisy, placed himself openly at the head of the independents and the soldiers.

A few days after his arrival, the army was on its march to London; a solemn engagement to maintain their cause to the last had been subscribed by all the regiments; under the title of an *humble representation*, they had addressed to parliament (June 14),³ no longer merely the picture of their own grievances, but the haughty expression of their views as to public affairs, the constitution of parliament, the elections, the right of petition, the general reform of the state.⁴ Finally, to these unprecedented demands was joined a project of impeachment against eleven members of the commons, Holles, Stapleton, Maynard, &c.,⁵ the enemies of the army, as they said, and the sole cause of the fatal mistakes into which parliament had fallen respecting it.

The presbyterians had foreseen the blow, and sought beforehand to shield themselves against it. For the last fortnight they had been using every effort to excite in their favour the people of the city: complaints had been made of the taxes on salt and meat: they were abolished (June 11 and 25);⁶ the apprentices had protested against the suppres-

¹ Burnet, i. 77.

² Holles, 99.

³ Rushworth, i. 4, 564.

⁴ Denzil Holles, sir Philip Stapleton, sir William Lewis, sir John Clotworthy, sir William Waller, sir John Maynard, Glynn, Anthony Nichols, major-general Massey, and colonels Walter Long and Harley (ib. 570).

⁵ Whitelocke, 252; Rushworth, i. 4, 592.

sion of religious festivals, particularly that of Christmas, hitherto always a period of merriment all over England: days of public recreation were appointed to take their place (June 8);¹ there was still a general clamour against the rapacity of a crowd of members, the accumulation of offices, indemnities, profits on sequestrations; the commons voted that no member should henceforth accept any lucrative office, or gift, or assigneeship of the estates of delinquents, and even that they should return into the public treasury the sums they had already received, and that their lands should be subjected to the common law for the payment of their debts (June 10);² lastly, the committee which had been appointed to receive the complaints of citizens, had fallen into disuse; it was reinstated on a more vigorous footing (June 3).³

But the day was come in which concessions were no longer a proof of anything but distress, and in which parties only acknowledged their faults to expiate them. The city detested the independents, but feared them; towards the presbyterian chiefs it felt a devotion devoid of respect or confidence, as towards decried and vanquished masters. For awhile these measures seemed to produce some effect: the common council declared their firm design to support parliament (June 10);⁴ a few squadrons of citizens were formed; the militia was recruited; the disbanded officers came in crowds to inscribe their names at Massey's, Waller's, and Holles's; preparations for defence were made round London;⁵ parliament voted (June 11) that the army should be called upon to retire, surrender the king to its commissioners, and that his majesty should be requested to reside at Richmond under the protection of parliament alone (June 15).⁶ But the army continued to advance. Fairfax wrote in its name to the common council (June 11 and 14),⁷ complaining of their allowing men to be recruited against it. The council sent an unmeaning reply, assigning its fear as an excuse, and protesting that if the army would retire, and consent to remain quartered forty miles from London, all dissensions would soon

¹ Parl. Hist. iii. 594; Whitelocke, 251—254; Rushworth, i. 4, 40C, 548.

² Parl. Hist. iii. 603; Whitelocke, 255. ³ Rushworth, i. 4, 500.

⁴ Parl. Hist. iii. 600; Whitelocke, 251.

⁵ Rushworth, i. 4, 552, &c.; Parl. Hist. iii. 614.

⁶ Parl. Hist. iii. 614.

⁷ Ib. 608—626.

cease (June 12 and 15).¹ Fairfax answered, that this letter came too late; that his head-quarters were already at St. Albans, and that a month's pay was absolutely necessary.² Parliament voted the pay, and insisted upon a retrograde movement (June 15 and 21).³ The army required that the eleven members, its enemies, should first be expelled from parliament (June 23).⁴ The commons could not resolve to deal themselves, with their own hands, so heavy a blow; the point had already been several times brought under discussion, but the majority had always answered that a vague accusation, without facts to support accusations, without proofs to make out the facts, could not deprive members of parliament of their rights.⁵ "The first accusation against lord Strafford," urged the army, "was also vague and entirely general; as you did then, we will do now, furnish our proofs afterwards;"⁶ and it still advanced. On the 26th of June its head-quarters were at Uxbridge. The city dispatched commissioners to it, but with no effect. The alarm increased every day; already the shops were kept shut, and the eleven members were bitterly animadverted upon for an obstinacy so deeply compromising for parliament and the city. They readily understood this language; and offered themselves to retire. Their devotion was accepted with eager gratitude (June 26);⁷ and the very day of their retirement, the commons voted that they adopted all the proceedings of the army, would provide for its support, that commissioners should be appointed to regulate in concert with those of the army the affairs of the kingdom; that in the meantime the king should be requested not to come to Richmond as it had lately been desired, and that in any case he should not reside nearer London than the head-quarters of the army.⁸ On these conditions Fairfax drew back a few miles, and appointed ten commissioners to treat with those of parliament (June 30 and July 1).⁹

¹ Rushworth, i. 4, 557; Parl. Hist. iii. 630.

² Rushworth, i. 4, 560; Parl. Hist. iii. 613.

³ Parl. Hist. iii. 631—639.

⁴ Ib. 640—650.

⁵ Holles, 119, &c.; Parl. Hist. iii. 653.

⁶ Rushworth, i. 4, 594.

⁷ Parl. Hist. iii. 654; Holles, 124; Clarendon, State Papers, ii. App.

xxxviii.

⁸ Parl. Hist. iii. 656.

⁹ Rushworth, i. 4, 596; Parl. Hist. iii. 661. The commissioners appointed by the army were, Cromwell, Ireton, Fleetwood, Rainsborough, Harrison, sir Hardress Waller Rich, Hammond, Lambert, and Desborough.

When the king heard of these resolutions, he was preparing to set out for Richmond, according to the desire of parliament, or at least to attempt to do so, for since that wish had been expressed, he had been the object of the closest surveillance, had been dragged, as it were, from town to town after the army, and at every halting-place found a number of guards placed round his lodgings. He had manifested great indignation at this: "Since my parliament," he said, "asks me to go to Richmond, if any one offers to prevent me, it must be by force and by seizing my bridle-rein; and for him that may dare attempt this, it shall not be my fault if it be not the last action of his life."¹ When he learned that the parliament itself opposed his departure, that it had conceded everything to the army, and was negotiating with it as with a conqueror, he smiled contemptuously at this humiliation of his first adversaries, and hastened to give another direction to his intrigues. Save the measures taken to prevent his escape, he had no matter of complaint against the army; the officers were as respectful towards him and far more complaisant than the commissioners of parliament. Two of his chaplains, doctors Sheldon and Hammond, had been allowed to live with him, and freely to do spiritual duty according to the rites of the episcopal church; his old servants, even the cavaliers who had been lately in arms, were no longer indiscriminately forbidden access to him; the duke of Richmond, the earl of Southampton, the marquis of Hertford, obtained leave to visit him; the leaders of the army seemed to take great pleasure in showing the royalist noblemen that they were capable of tempering power with generosity; and even in the inferior ranks, the military spirit repelled those minute precautions, those petty rigours, from which, at Newcastle and Holmby, the king had so often been a sufferer.² Since the surrender of Oxford, his youngest children, the duke of York, the princess Elizabeth, and the duke of Gloucester, had resided either at St. James's Palace or Sion House, near London, under the charge of the earl of Northumberland, to whom parliament had entrusted them. Charles expressed a wish to see them, and Fairfax at once urged the request officially upon parliament. "Who, if he can imagine it to

¹ Huntingdon, *Memoirs*

² Herbert, *passim*.

be his own case," he said, "cannot but be sorry if his majesty's natural affection to his children, in so small a thing, should not be complied with?"¹ The interview took place (July 15) at Maidenhead, amidst a large concourse of people, who strewed with evergreens and flowers the roads by which the royal family came to meet each other; and far from conceiving any anger or distrust at this, officers and soldiers, touched, in common with the people, by the happiness of the father at the sight of his children, permitted him to take them with him to Caversham, where he then resided, and keep them for two days.² Some of them, moreover, Cromwell and Ireton in particular, too clear-sighted to flatter themselves that their struggle with the presbyterians was at an end and their victory secure, felt, on calculating all the chances, uneasy respecting the future, and considering the various aspects which the approaching crisis might assume, put it to one another whether the favour of the king restored to authority by their hands, would not be the best security for their party, the surest means of fortune and power for themselves.³

The rumour of this disposition of things, of the attentions paid by the army to the king, of the advances made to him by some of its leaders, soon spread throughout the kingdom. The conditions offered him were even stated, and pamphlets were circulated, some praising, others blaming the army. The leaders thought it necessary officially to contradict these reports, and even to demand, in a tone of anger, the punishment of their authors (July 1).⁴ But the negotiations with the king were none the less continued. The officers were respectful, courteous, assiduous in their attentions; familiar, almost friendly intercourse was established between them and the cavaliers, as between men who, having honourably fought each other, now only desired to live in peace. The king himself wrote to the queen on the subject with some confidence, and the new hopes soon became the sole topic of conversation with the few emigrants who had followed her to Paris, or had sought refuge in Normandy, at Rouen, Caen, or Dieppe. Two men in particular, occupied themselves in

¹ His letter was of the 8th of July; *Parl. Hist.* iii. 679.

² Rushworth, i. 4, 625; *Clarendon*, iii. 86.

³ Huntingdon, *Memoirs*, 155.

⁴ *Parl. Hist.* *ut sup.*

spreading the intelligence abroad, carefully making it appear that they knew more about the matter than they thought fit to explain, and that no one could render in this affair such important services to the king as themselves. One of them, sir John Berkley, had valiantly defended himself in Exeter, and had not surrendered the place till three weeks before the king fled to the Scottish camp; the other, Ashburnham, had only quitted the king at Newcastle, to escape the effects of the animosity borne him by parliament; both vain, boasting intriguers, Berkley with most courage, Ashburnham more crafty, and possessing more influence over the king. Berkley, by chance, Ashburnham, by order of Charles himself, had had some correspondence with a few of the principal officers, enough, in their opinion, to boast of and profit by. The queen received all their assurances without hesitation; and by her orders, in the beginning of July, they both set out, a few days after each other, to present themselves to the king and the army as negotiators.¹ Berkley was no sooner landed, than a cavalier of his acquaintance, sir Allen Apsley,² came to meet him, sent by Cromwell, Lambert, and some others, to assure him that they had not forgotten their conversation with him after the taking of Exeter, nor his excellent counsels, and that they were ready to benefit by them, and pressed him to hasten. On receiving this message, proud to find himself of more importance than even he himself had imagined, Berkley, stopping but a moment in London, pressed on to headquarters, at this time at Reading. He had only been there three hours, when Cromwell sent to apologize for not being able to visit him at once; and the same day, at ten in the evening, Berkley heard Cromwell, Rainsborough, and sir Hardress Waller announced. All three made protestations of their good intentions towards the king, Rainsborough drily, Cromwell with expressions of deep feeling: "I have just witnessed," said he, "the most touching spectacle, the interview of the king with his children; no one has been more deceived than I about his majesty; he is, I am now sure of it, the best man in the three kingdoms; for our parts, we are infinitely indebted to him; we had been ruined, utterly undone, had he accepted the proposals of the Scots at Newcastle. May

¹ Clarendon, iii. 81

² Mrs. Hutchinson's brother.

God deal out his goodness to me according to the sincerity of my heart towards his majesty!" According to him, the officers were all convinced that if the king did not resume possession of his just rights, no man in England could enjoy in security his life and property; and a decisive step on their part would soon leave no doubts on his majesty's mind of their true sentiments. Berkley, perfectly delighted, procured next morning an audience of the king, and gave him an account of this interview. Charles received it coldly, as one who had often received similar overtures, and put no trust in them, or wished, at all events, by his reserve, to have his belief purchased at a valuable rate. Berkley retired confounded, but thinking, not without some resentment, that the king, who knew him but little, perhaps entertained some prejudice against him, and that Ashburnham, who would shortly arrive, would be more successful. Meanwhile, he continued his negotiations with the army; the officers crowded around him, and even the common agitators, some the friends and creatures of Cromwell, others who mistrusted him and advised Berkley to be on his guard against him—"For," said they, "he is a man on whom no one can rely, and who changes his conduct and language every day to every person, wholly absorbed with the desire of being at all events, let what may occur, the leader of the successful party." Ireton, however, Cromwell's most intimate confidant, seemed to Berkley to act with perfect fairness and candour; he communicated to him the proposals that the general council of officers was preparing, and even adopted some alterations that he suggested. Nothing so moderate had hitherto been offered to the king: they required that he should give up for ten years the command of the militia and the nomination to the great offices of state; that seven of his councillors should remain banished from the kingdom; that all civil and coercive power should be withdrawn from the presbyterian bishops and ministers; that no peer created since the outbreak of the war should be allowed to take his seat in the house; that no cavalier should be admitted a member of the next parliament. "It is necessary," said Ireton, "that some difference should exist and appear between the conquered and the conquerors." But to these conditions, much less exacting than those of parliament, was not added the obligation of abolishing the epis-

epal church, nor that of ruining the majority of the royalists by enormous fines, nor the legal interdiction, so to speak, of the king and his party during the pleasure of the parliament. On the other hand, the army, it is true, required reforms not previously demanded, and, in reality, of a still graver character: a mere equal distribution of electoral rights and of public taxation; a change in the civil procedure, the abolition of a crowd of political, judicial, and commercial privileges; in a word, the introduction into the social system, and into law, of principles of equality hitherto unknown. But even in the thoughts of the proposers, it was not against the king, his dignity or power, that these demands were directed; none deemed prerogative interested in the maintenance of rotten boroughs, the scandalous profits of the lawyers, or the frauds of a few debtors. Berkley, accordingly, looked upon these conditions as characterized by unhopèd for lenity; never, in his opinion, had a crown so nearly lost been recovered at so cheap a rate. He solicited and obtained leave to communicate them privately to the king (about July 25), before they were officially presented by the army. His astonishment was still greater than at their first interview; Charles considered the conditions very hard, and spoke of them indignantly: "If they really wished to come to terms with me," he said, "they would make propositions that I could accept." Berkley ventured to make a few observations, and to urge the danger of a refusal: "No," said the king, abruptly breaking off the conversation, "without me these people cannot extricate themselves; you will soon see them too happy to accept more equitable conditions."¹

Berkley was endeavouring in vain to find out the grounds for such confidence, when the news reached head-quarters that the most violent insurrectionary excitement prevailed in the city, that bands of citizens and apprentices were constantly besieging Westminster-hall, that it was expected every hour parliament would be obliged to vote the return of the king and the re-admission of the eleven members, resolutions most fatal to the army and its party. For the last fortnight, especially since a leave of absence for six months (July 20)² sent to the eleven members had deprived their party of all

¹ Berkley, *Memoirs*.

² *Parl. Hist.* iii. 712; *Rushworth*, i. 4, 628.

immediate hope, symptoms more and more threatening, mobs, petitions, tumultuous cries, gave announcement of this explosion; a measure which was regarded on both sides as decisive, caused it to burst forth. The presbyterian committee, intrusted for the last two months with the direction of the London militia, was dissolved, and the independents regained possession of that important position (July 25). The city could not resign itself to be thus represented and commanded by its enemies; in a few hours the excitement became general; a paper posted up in Skinner's-hall, containing an engagement to use every effort to accomplish the king's return in honour and liberty to London, was instantly covered with an immense number of signatures; upon the departure of the courier for head-quarters, copies of it were dispatched all over England; a petition was drawn up demanding for it the sanction of parliament; the disbanded officers united with the people; everything announced a movement as general as energetic.¹

The army immediately marched towards London (July 23); Fairfax wrote threatening letters in its name; in parliament, the independents, strengthened by this support, declared all persons who should subscribe the engagement of the city to be traitors (July 24). But these threats came too late to repress public excitement: on the second day after this declaration, early in the morning, numerous groups of apprentices, disbanded officers, and watermen, pressed around the doors of Westminster-hall; noisy, abusive, and evidently come with some daring design. On taking their seats (July 26), the alarmed commons ordered the doors to be closed, and that no member should leave without permission. A petition was then presented from the common council, in moderate and respectful terms, requesting that the command of the militia should be restored to the leaders from whom it had just been withdrawn, and informing parliament of the impatience of the people, but without any appearance of a desire to intimidate. While the house was discussing this petition, the speaker received notice that the multitude outside had another to present; two members went out to receive it; it was read immediately. It expressed the same feelings as that of the

¹ Parl. Hist. iii. 712; Rushworth, i. 4, 685; Holles, 144, &c.

common council, in language much more temperate than had been anticipated. But the debate continued, and no answer was returned; the day was drawing to a close; the multitude, instead of growing tired, became irritated; it took possession of all the avenues to the house; already the tumult of feet and voices rang through the hall; cries of "Let us go in! let us go in!" were heard, and violent blows shook the door. Several members drew their swords, and for a moment drove back the assailants. The house of peers was equally menaced; some apprentices climbed up to the windows, and hurled stones through them, quite ready to proceed to greater extremities if they were not heard. The members in either house resisted for a while: at last, the door of the commons was broken open; the most furious of the rioters, to the number of forty or fifty, rushed in, and with their hats on, and the most menacing gestures, supported by the crowd pressing behind them, exclaimed: "Vote, vote!" Parliament gave way; the declaration of the preceding day was revoked, and the militia again placed under the direction of the presbyterian committee. The tumult seemed at an end; the members rose to depart, the speaker had left the chair; the mob seized him, and made him resume it. "What do you require further?" asked he. "That the king be desired to come to London forthwith." The proposition was immediately put to the vote and adopted; Ludlow alone opposed it by a firm and loud "No."¹

At this news, an excitement nearly as great arose in the army, particularly in the lower ranks, among the agitators and soldiers; on all sides, the king was charged with perfidy, with being an accomplice in what had taken place. Lord Lauderdale, who had come from London to confer with him on the part of the Scottish commissioners, gave rise to so much distrust, that one morning before he was up a party of soldiers abruptly entered his bed-room and obliged him to depart immediately, without again seeing the king.² Ashburnham, who had arrived three days before, increased their displeasure and suspicions by his scornful insolence; he refused all intercourse with the agitators: "I have always lived in the best company," said he to Berkley; "I cannot converse with such fellows as these: if we could gain the officers sure to the

¹ Parl. Hist. iii. 717, &c.; Rushworth, i. 4, 640—644; Ludlow, 88.

² Rushworth, ii. 4, 737.

king, through them we shall have the whole army; and I shall therefore apply myself wholly to them."¹ Even among those officers who had made advances to the king, several now began to hold themselves apart: "Sir," said Ireton, "you assume to be arbiter between the parliament and us; it is we who will be arbiters between you and the parliament."² Yet, still uneasy as to what was passing in London, they resolved formally to present their proposals to him (Aug. 1). Ashburnham and Berkley were present at the conference. Charles was cold and haughty, listened with an ironical smile to the reading of the proposals, rejected almost all of them in few words and a bitter tone, as if sure of his strength, and well-pleased to manifest his displeasure. Ireton roughly supported them, saying that the army would make no further concessions. Charles interrupted him abruptly: "You cannot be without me; you will fall to ruin if I do not sustain you." The officers looked at Ashburnham and Berkley with astonishment, as if to inquire the meaning of such a reception; Berkley, in his turn, sought by his anxious looks to warn the king of his imprudence, but without success. At last, approaching him, he whispered in his ear: "Your majesty speaks as if you had some secret strength and power that I do not know of; and since your majesty hath concealed it from me, I wish you had concealed it from these men too." Charles perceived he had said too much, and hastened to soften his language; but the officers, most of them, at least, had already taken their resolution; Rainsborough, indeed, the most opposed of them all to any accommodation, had silently left the room, to inform the army that it was impossible to trust the king; and the conference ended in a dry, listless manner, as between persons who could no longer agree, nor longer deceive one another.³

The officers had scarcely returned to head-quarters when several carriages arrived from London; and to the great astonishment of the crowd, more than sixty members of both houses alighted from them,⁴ having at their head their two

¹ Berkley, 34.

² Ib.

³ Ib. 35.

⁴ The number is very uncertain; Holles positively mentions eight lords, and fifty-eight members of the commons; Rushworth (ii. 4, 750), speaks of fourteen lords and *about* one hundred members of the commons; this is also the statement of Whitelocke (263.) The call of the house made in

speakers, lord Manchester and Mr. Lenthall, who explained that they had just escaped from the fury of the mob, and had come to the army for safety and freedom. The joy of the army was equal to its surprise: it had dreaded a violent rupture with parliament, but now it was the parliament itself, with its legal chiefs, its faithful members, which sought its protection. Officers and soldiers surrounded the fugitives, listened with indignation to the recital of the dangers and insults they had been subjected to, were profuse in thanks, in expressions of devoted respect, and praised the Lord for inspiring them with so patriotic a resolution. With Cromwell and his friends all this surprise was feigned; for the last five days, by agents in London, particularly by the intervention of St. John, Vane, Haslerig, and Ludlow, they had been labouring to produce this secession.¹

Berkley hastened to communicate this melancholy news to the king, conjuring him on the instant to address a letter to the leaders of the army which should give them hopes of a better reception for their proposals, or which should at least disarm suspicion, and lessen the ill effect of the late interview. This, he said, was the advice of Cromwell and Ireton, who, on this condition, still answered for the disposition of the army. But Charles had also received news from London: the riot had taken place by his contrivance and consent, and he now learned that on the very day the fugitive members departed, the members who remained, a large majority, had elected two new speakers; the commons, Mr. Pelham, the peers, lord Willoughby of Parham; that the eleven proscribed members had resumed their seats, that parliament thus re-organized had immediately sent orders for the army to stop where it was, had directed the city to prepare every means of defence, and Massey, Brown, Waller, and Poyntz to raise regiments with all speed. The zeal of the people in London, it was said, was very great: at a meeting of the common council, thousands of apprentices presented themselves, and swore to do their utmost for the crown, against whatever danger, against whatever enemies. The inhabitants of Southwark alone had manifested opposite sentiments; but as they were

the upper house, on the 30th of July, indicates the absence of twenty lords. — *Parl. Hist.* iii. 727. All the fugitives did not leave London together.

¹ *Parl. Hist.* iii. 723—731; Rushworth, i. 4; 646. Ludlow, *Mem.* 88, &c.

bringing up their petition to Guildhall, Poyntz, followed by a few officers, drove them back so roughly, that assuredly they would not venture to make another attempt. Money was levied, cannon placed on the ramparts. Finally, the king was formally invited to return to London; and this vote, proclaimed by sound of trumpet in every street, was to reach him within a few hours, or at latest the next day.¹

"I shall wait," said the king to Berkley; "there will be time enough to write this letter." Meantime, a messenger arrived from head-quarters; fresh fugitives from Westminster had come to join their colleagues; others had written that they should retire into the country, and disavow this pretended parliament. Even in London, the independents, few in number but determined, lost neither time nor courage; they thwarted, delayed, and weakened every measure they could not absolutely prevent; the money collected was but slowly employed; Massey's recruits were without arms; a few presbyterian preachers, Mr. Marshall among others, gained over by the army, exerted themselves with the people to arouse their fears and to inspire them with a desire for reconciliation; worthy members of parliament and of the council, already listened to them, flattered by the idea of having the honour to re-establish peace. In a word, Cromwell sent word to Ashburnham that within two days the city would be in their power.²

Charles still hesitated; he assembled his most confidential servants; the letter was composed, debated, thrown aside, resumed; at length he signed it (Aug. 4).³ Ashburnham and Berkley set off with it to head-quarters; they met on the road a second messenger, dispatched by two officers, friends of theirs, to urge its transmission with the least possible delay; they arrived. The submission of the city had arrived before them. The fugitive members had just reviewed the army on Hounslow Heath (Aug. 3), amidst immense acclamations; it was marching with them at its head towards London, certain of entering it without obstacle. The king's letter and alliance were no longer of any value to conquerors.⁴

On the second day after, the 6th of August, a brilliant and

¹ Rushworth, i. 4, 652-656; Parl. Hist. iii. 728.

² Berkley, 38; Ludlow, 90.

³ Rushworth, ii. 4, 753.

⁴ Berkeley, 30; Rushworth, ii. 4, 750.

formidable procession set out from Kensington for Westminster; three regiments composed the vanguard, a fourth the rear; between them rode Fairfax and his staff on horseback, the fugitive members in their carriages, and behind them a multitude of their partisans, eager to share their triumph. A double rank of soldiers lined the road, all with branches of laurel in their hats, and shouting, "Long live the parliament! the free parliament!" At Hyde park they found the lord mayor and aldermen come to compliment the general on the re-establishment of peace between the army and the city; Fairfax scarcely answered them as he passed. Further on, at Charing-cross, the common council in a body presented themselves in like manner, and had an equally unfavourable reception. Arrived at Westminster, it was discovered that most of the presbyterian leaders were flown, or had concealed themselves; Fairfax re-established the friends of the army in their seats, listened with an air of modesty to their pompous thanks, heard a month's pay voted for his troops, and then went to take possession of the Tower, of which he had just been appointed governor.¹

Two days after, Skippon in the centre and Cromwell in the rear, the whole army marched through London, grave, silent, in the strictest order; no excesses were committed, not one citizen received the slightest insult;² the leaders desired at once to reassure and to awe the city. They did not fail in this object: at the sight of those armed men, so disciplined though so haughty in their mien, so obedient yet so threatening, the presbyterians shut themselves up in their houses, the independents everywhere resumed possession of power, the timid crowded, with eager confidence, round the conquerors. The common council solicited Fairfax and his officers to accept a public dinner. He refused; they only the more hastened the chasing of a golden ewer to be offered to him.³ There was even a certain number of apprentices who came to offer him their congratulations, and he received them in a formal audience, delighted to make it appear that, among these dreaded youths also, the army had its partisans.⁴ On their part, both houses, the lords more especially, made a servile parade of their gratitude,

¹ Rushworth, ii. 4, 756; Parl. Hist. iii. 736, &c.; Holles, 100.

² Ludlow, 90.

³ Rushworth, ii. 4, 701—704; Holles, 220.

⁴ Rushworth, ii. 4, 778.

and voted that all that had been done during the absence of the members who had sought a refuge with the army, was, of itself, null and void, without any special repeal (Aug. 6).¹ This vote disquieted the commons; they were ready to prosecute the authors of the riot which had caused the secession; but most of the members who had remained at Westminster had taken a part in those acts which they were now called upon to declare absolutely void; three times they refused to yield this point (Aug. 10 and 19).² Next day (Aug. 20), a troop of horse encamped in Hyde park; troops were stationed round the house, at every avenue to it; within, Cromwell and Ireton supported with menaces the resolution of the lords;³ it was at length adopted; and nothing was now wanting to the triumph of the army, for even those who had been subjected by it, proclaimed its legitimacy.

After this great and facile success, the revolutionary movement, hitherto restrained or regulated, even among the independents, by the necessities of the struggle, soared freely; each man's passions, hopes, and dreams became bold, and openly declared themselves. In the higher ranks of the party, in the house of commons, in the general council of officers, republican projects came forth plain and positive: already, for some time past, Vane, Ludlow, Haslerig, Martyn, Scott, and Hutchinson, had scarcely answered when any one accused them of hostility to monarchy; they now openly spoke of it with contempt; the principle of the sovereignty of the people, and, in the name of the people, one sole assembly appointed by the people, now guided all their actions and words; in their conversations, any idea of accommodation with the king, no matter upon what terms, was treated as treason. In the ranks below them, among the people as well as in the army, the excitement of men's minds was as general as it was intense; in everything, reforms till then unheard of were demanded, on all sides reformers rose up; to their wild desires no law imposed respect, no fact seemed an obstacle; all the more confident and imperious, in proportion to the profoundness of their ignorance and obscurity, their petitions,

¹ Parl. Hist. iii. 745.

² The proposition was rejected by 96 to 93, 85 to 83, and 87 to 84; Parl. Hist. iii. 756—773.

³ Holles, Memoirs, 172; Parl. Hist. iii. 758—773.

their pamphlets every day poured forth, hurled menace in all directions. Summoned before the judges, they brought the judges themselves in question, and ordered them to leave seats they had usurped; attacked in the churches by the presbyterian ministers, they rushed to the pulpits, dragged from it the preachers, and preached in their place, sincere in the very ravings they made use of to serve their passions. No powerful and entire theory, no precise and general plan presided over this movement; all of them republicans, these popular champions carried their thoughts and wishes far beyond a revolution in the government; they aimed at changing society itself, the relations, manners, and feelings of the community; but in all this their views were narrow and confused; some spent their daring in merely prosecuting some important but partial innovation, such as the abolition of the privileges of the lords or the lawyers; others were content with some pious dream, such as expecting the approaching reign of the Lord; others, under the name of *rationalists*, claimed absolute sovereignty for each man's reason;¹ others talked of introducing a strict equality of rights and property, and these, their enemies nicknamed *levellers*. But neither this decried name, which they always vehemently rejected, nor any other, was appropriate to them; for they neither formed a sect devoted to a systematic belief, nor a faction eager to advance towards a definite end. Citizens or soldiers, visionaries or demagogues, felt a desire of innovation, earnest but without any plan; vague instincts of equality, above all, a rude spirit of independence: such were their common characteristics; and inspired by an ambition short-sighted but pure, perfectly intractable by all whom they deemed weak or self-interested, they constituted in turn the strength and the terror of the different parties, all successively compelled to make use of and to deceive them.

No one had succeeded so well in doing the one and the other as Cromwell; no one enjoyed as he did the confiding intimacy of these obscure but powerful enthusiasts. Everything in him had found favour in their eyes; the irregular

¹ Clarendon, State Papers, ii., Appendix 11.

outbursts of his imagination, his eagerness to make himself the equal and the companion of the rough and boorish, his language at once mystic and familiar, his manners by turns commonplace and exalted, giving him at one time the air of an inspired preacher, and at others that of a plain peasant, even that free and supple genius which seemed to place at the service of a holy cause all the resources of mundane ability. He had sought and found among them his most useful agents, Ayres, Evanson, Berry, Sexby, Sheppard, Wildman, all leading members of the council of agitators, all ever ready at a word from the lieutenant-general to stir up the army against king or parliament. Lilburne himself, the most unmanageable and least credulous of these men, who had quitted his regiment because he could not obey, had the greatest confidence in Cromwell: "I have looked upon you," he wrote to him, "as among the powerful ones of England, as a man with heart perfectly pure, perfectly free from all personal views;"¹ and Cromwell more than once had made use of Lilburne's courage against the presbyterians. But when the ruin of the latter seemed accomplished, when the independents held in their power the king, the parliament, and the city, when all the revolutionary passions and desires burst forth, insatiable, blind, ungovernable, the situation of the leaders of the party, that of Cromwell in particular, already the object to whom all men's attention was turned, became affected. In their turn, they incurred distrust and felt fear. Many of their own party had viewed with disapprobation the negotiations entered into with the king; necessity alone, the danger of falling within the power of the presbyterians, had dominated disgust and kept suspicions under constraint. Now all this necessity had disappeared; the Lord had given into the hands of his servants all his enemies. Yet instead of securing and perfecting the triumph of His cause, the conqueror continued to live in friendship with, to treat with the delinquents. The first, the most culpable of all, the one on whose head a few of the faithful had already, for two years,² been invoking public vengeance, and who lately, in his insane pride,

¹ Letter of March 25th, 1647.

² As early as May, 1646, a few independents had demanded the punishment of the king, as the greatest delinquent.—Baillie, ii. 200.

had rejected proposals which ought perhaps never to have been made to him, the king, far from losing anything by the late events, had almost regained by them his power and splendour. With the consent of the generals, he had returned to his palace of Hampton Court (Aug. 24), and resided there amid idolatrous pomp, surrounded by a court more arrogant than ever. His former councillors, Richmond, Hertford, Capel, Southampton, had hastened to rejoin him, as if he were about to reassume the exercise of sovereign power.¹ Ormond himself, the most dangerous leader of the royalists in Ireland, he who had so lately kept up the struggle in that kingdom against the parliament, and only had at last, with the greatest difficulty been induced to surrender Dublin, Ormond, upon his return to England, had been received by the general, the lieutenant-general, by almost all the leading personages of the army, with eager complaisance,² and had free access to the king, doubtless meditating with him another insurrection in Ireland. At the same time, the most active confidants of the king, Berkley, Ashburnham, Ford, and Apsley, were constantly going to and fro between the court and head-quarters; the doors of Cromwell and Ireton were always open to them, while a number of the well-affected could gain no admittance there. Cromwell and Ireton themselves, either in person or by their messengers, maintained an assiduous intercourse with the king; they had been seen walking alone with him in the park, were known to be often closeted with him. Even their wives, Mrs. Cromwell, Mrs. Ireton, Mrs. Whalley, had been presented at Hampton Court, and the king had received them with great honours.³ So much familiarity was scandalous; such repeated conference must needs mean treachery. Every day, among the republicans and enthusiasts, particularly in the meetings of the soldiers, this language was held. Even from the dungeon of the Tower, where the lords had imprisoned him, to repress if possible his harangues and his pamphlets, Lilburne addressed to Cromwell violent reproaches, and his letter finished with these words: "If you despise, as hitherto, my warnings, be

¹ Herbert, 33: Hutchinson, 276.

² Whitelocke, 267.

³ Clarendon, State Papers, ii., Appendix 11.

sure I will use against you all the power and influence I have, and so as to produce in your fortune changes that shall little please you."¹

Cromwell had small respect for Lilburne's advice, and cared not for his threats, standing alone, but it was different when they were backed by the anger of so many of his heretofore devoted adherents. Ready to throw himself, when necessary, even with temerity, into the vortex of intrigue and daring hopes, he had still a keen sense of dangers and obstacles, and whatever his aim or passion, looked around him on every side, found out all that was going on, and directed his course accordingly. He begged Berkley and Ashburnham not to visit him so often, and the king to permit him to observe more caution in their intercourse. "If I am an honest man," he said, "I have done enough to convince his majesty of the sincerity of my intentions; if not, nothing will suffice."² At the same time, he went to the Tower, paid Lilburne a long visit, held forth in earnest and pathetic language touching his zeal for their common cause, urged with vehemence the danger of the slightest disunion, asked him what he meant to do upon regaining his liberty, and promised, upon taking leave, to use every effort with the committee to whom the subject was referred, to hasten his release.³

Lilburne was not set at liberty; the committee, of which Henry Martyn was chairman, even postponed their report;⁴ and the intercourse of Cromwell with the king, though less open, was not less active. A stranger to the blind presumption of his party, devoured by ambition and doubt, the most contrary combinations and anticipations agitated his mind, and he was unwilling to break faith or to pledge himself to any of them irremediably. The success of the republicans seemed to him unquestionable, the desires of the enthusiasts chimerical; the casuistical and passionate insubordination of the soldiers threatened his own power; the quality of his mind rendered him intolerant of disorder, even while fomenting it; the king's name was still a power, his alliance a means, his re-establishment a chance; he kept it in reserve like many others, ready to abandon it for a better, pushing

¹ This letter bears date 13th August, 1647.

² Berkley, 42.

³ Biographia Britannica, Article Lilburne, v. 2950.

⁴ *Ib.*

his own fortune by every path which promised the greatest or readiest success. The king, on his side, well informed of the disposition of minds in parliament and the army, gave another turn to his negotiations; they were now addressed less to the party than to its leaders, and indicated individual favours rather than public concessions. To Ireton was offered the government of Ireland; to Cromwell the office of commander-in-chief, the colonelcy of the king's guards, the title of earl of Essex, and the garter; similar advantages were mentioned with reference to their principal friends. Meantime, two royalists, judge Jenkins and a cavalier, sir Lewis Dewes, prisoners in the Tower with Lilburne, were continually talking with him of the treaty already concluded, they said, between the generals and the court, mentioned its conditions, stirred up his suspicions, and urged him to propagate them. Merely suspected, such a bargain threw the party into confusion; accepted, it would assure the king the support of the leaders, or leave themselves without support.¹

The two generals could not be ignorant as to these manœuvres; they had surrounded the king with their spies; colonel Whalley, whose regiment had charge of him, was the cousin and creature of Cromwell; the least incident in the king's life, his walks, his conversations, the visits and the proceedings of his councillors, the indiscretions of his servants, were minutely reported to them;² and more than once they complained that reports from Hampton Court, spread abroad as if by design, by destroying their credit with the army, rendered them incapable of serving the king in that quarter. Ireton, in particular, of more unbending mind, and less tolerant of deceit, was so much displeased, that he was on the point of breaking off the negotiations. They, however, continued; and soon even the public conduct of the generals seemed to confirm the suspicions of the soldiers. At the entreaties of the Scots, and to give some satisfaction to the friends of peace (Aug. 27),³ parliament had decided that the proposals made at Newcastle should once more be presented to the king; the earls of Lauderdale and Lanark, lately

¹ Berkeley, 40.

² See, in Rushworth ii. 4, 795, a letter, in which Whalley gives an account of the manner in which the king spends his time, and of everything which happens at Hampton Court.

³ Parl. Hist. iii. 774.

arrived at Hampton Court, once more conjured him to accept them and join the presbyterians, who alone were sincere in the wish to save him.¹ Alarmed at this danger, Cromwell and Ireton redoubled their protestations and promises to the king, advised him to reject the proposals, to require that those of the army, far more moderate, should be made the basis of a new negotiation, and promised to support the demand with their utmost influence. "We are determined," Ireton sent him word, "to purge the house, and purge it again, and purge it still, until it shall be disposed to arrange amicably your majesty's affairs; for my part, rather than fail in what I have promised the king, I would ally myself with the French, the Spaniards, the cavaliers, with any who would assist me in accomplishing it."² Charles followed the advice of the generals, and on receiving his answer,³ a violent debate arose in the commons; the irritated presbyterians would not deviate from their proposals; the fanatics demanded that none at all should be received or offered. As they had promised, Cromwell and Ireton urged the fulfilment of the king's desire, and that a treaty should be opened between him and the parliament, on the conditions offered by the army; a step, on their part, the more marked from its being altogether without result, the presbyterians and the fanatics having united to defeat it (Sept. 22).⁴

The distrust and anger of the soldiers assumed a menacing form; at every station societies were formed, some of them open and tumultuous, others secret; everywhere the words "ambition, treachery, deceit," were re-echoed, always in connexion with the name of Cromwell; every expression which had escaped from him in the heat of discourse was brought to mind and angrily commented upon: he had, for instance, talked of the necessity of ceasing the persecution of the cavaliers; he had said: "Now that I have the king in my hand, I have the parliament in my pocket:"⁵ at another time: "Since Holles and Stapleton have had so much authority, I do not see why I should not govern the kingdom as well as they. And again, it was he who in the committee charged with the affair

¹ Ludlow, 92.

² Huntingdon, 155.

³ This answer was dated September 9, 1647.—Parl. Hist. iii. 777—779.

⁴ Berkley, 44; Ludlow, *ut sup.*; Huntingdon, 321.

⁵ Banks, A Critical Review, &c. 83.

of Lilburne, had brought forward a thousand little incidents, tending to have him still kept in prison.¹ Lilburne formally denounced him to the agitators, enumerating all the offices held by him and his adherents.² The agitators in their turn demanded of parliament the release of Lilburne,³ of Fairfax that of four soldiers, confined, as they said, merely for a few offensive and threatening words against the king.⁴ It was even proposed among Lilburne, Wildman, and some others, to get rid of Cromwell by assassination.⁵ No such attempt, however, was made; but whether on this occasion, or from some other cause, even the council of agitators became suspected by the soldiers; the lieutenant-general, they said, had spies among them who informed him of everything. To avoid this danger, several regiments appointed, under the name of *new agents*, purer agitators, charged to watch the traitors and serve the good cause in whatever place, at whatever price. A few superior officers, and some members of the commons, Rainsborough, Ewers, Harrison, Robert Lilburne,⁶ and Scott, placed themselves at the head of this movement; and the most violent faction, thus separated from the general council of officers and parliament, began openly to proclaim its maxims and designs.

Cromwell grew uneasy: he saw the army disanited, the royalists and the presbyterians watching the moment to profit by its discords, himself attacked by men of inexorable will, hitherto his most faithful allies, his most useful instruments. From day to day the king's intentions became more and more suspected: "I shall play my game as well as I can," said Charles to Ireton, who pressed him to join them openly;⁷ and lords Lauderdale and Lanark, still assiduous in their attendance, promised him the support of a Scottish army if he would accept of their alliance. Already, it was said, the preliminaries of a treaty were agreed upon; it was even added that in Scotland, where Hamilton's credit prevailed over that of Argyle, troops were marching towards the bor-

¹ Biographia Britannica, art. 'Lilburne.' ² Ib. ³ Rushworth, ii. 4, 790.

⁴ Ib. 808.

⁵ Holles, 185.

⁶ The brother of John Lilburne, and colonel of a regiment of infantry

⁷ Beginning of October.—Ludlow, 91; Journals, Lords, Nov. 16, 17, 1647.

⁸ Hutchinson, 277.

ders.¹ On their side, the English cavaliers, Capel, Langdale, and Musgrave, were secretly getting up an insurrection. "Be assured," the king had said to Capel, "the two nations will soon be at war; the Scotch promise themselves the co-operation of all the presbyterians in England; let our friends, then, hold themselves ready and in arms; for otherwise, whichever party is victorious, we shall get very little by it."² Meantime, the situation of the army quartered near London became critical; the city paid no attention to the demands made for money to pay the men, and the officers knew not how to govern troops whom they could not pay.³ In all directions the most daring pamphlets were circulated; some setting forth the designs of the soldiers against the king, others the king's negotiations with the generals. In vain had Fairfax demanded and obtained, readily enough so far, the establishment of a rigorous censorship;⁴ in vain had Cromwell himself represented to the city the necessities of the army; in vain had he displayed all the resources of reason and craft, to persuade the fanatics that they must restrain their fanaticism if they thought to be paid by the moderate, the moderate that, to keep the fanatics in check, they must pay them;⁵ in vain had he succeeded in getting some of his confidants elected among the new agents of the soldiers. His efforts were without result; even his very prudence turned against him; he had kept up a correspondence, had secured, as he imagined, means of action with all parties; and now everywhere a wild, indomitable excitement threatened to countervail his schemes, to ruin his influence. The end of so much ability, so much exertion, had only been to burden his situation with greater difficulty and danger.

Amid this perplexity, one of the spies he had at Hampton Court, in the very chamber of the king, sent him word that on that day, a letter addressed to the queen would be dispatched from the castle, containing Charles's real designs towards the army and its leaders. The letter, sewn up in a saddle, carried on his head by a man, not in the secret, would reach, about ten o'clock that night, the Blue

¹ Rushworth, ii. 4, 786—810.

² Clarendon, iii. 106.

³ Rushworth, ii. 4, 804, &c.

⁴ By an ordinance of September 30, 1647; *Parl. Hist.* iii. 779—781; Rushworth, ii. 4, 799.

⁵ Rushworth, ii. 4, 863, 884.

Bear in Holborn; a horse was ready waiting there to take the bearer to Dover, whence the packet would sail for France. Cromwell and Ireton at once formed their resolution. Disguised as private soldiers, and followed by a single trooper, they left Windsor to go to the appointed place. On their arrival, they placed their attendant on the watch at the door, and entering the tavern, sat down at a table and had some beer. Towards ten, the messenger appeared, the saddle on his head: receiving immediate notice of this, they went out, sword in hand, seized the saddle under the pretext that they had orders to search everything, carried it into the inn, ripped it open, found the letter, carefully closed up the saddle again, and then returned it to the terrified messenger, saying, with an air of good humour, that he was an honest fellow, and might continue his journey.

Their informant had not deceived them: Charles, indeed, wrote to the queen that he was courted alike by both factions, that he should join the one whose conditions should be most for his advantage, and that he thought he should rather treat with the Scottish presbyterians than with the army: "For the rest," he added, "I alone understand my position; be quite easy as to the concessions which I may grant; when the time comes, I shall very well know how to treat these rogues, and instead of a silken garter, I will fit them with a hempen halter." The two generals looked at each other, and all their suspicions thus confirmed, returned to Windsor, henceforward as free from uncertainty respecting their designs upon the king as respecting his towards them.¹

It was full time their conduct should cease to be wavering and undecided: the wrath of the fanatics broke forth, and threw the army into the greatest confusion. On the 9th of October, in the name of five regiments of horse, among which Cromwell's own regiment figured, the new agitators drew up, under the title of "The Case of the Army," a long declaration of their suspicions, their principles, and their wishes. On the 18th, they presented it officially to the general; and on the 1st of November a second pamphlet, entitled, "An Agreement of the People for a firm and present Peace on the ground of common right," addressed to the whole nation in

¹ This occurred in the course of October; Clarendon, State Papers, ii. Appendix, xxxviii.

the name of sixteen regiments. In both, the soldiers accused the officers of treachery, the parliament of malversation, exhorted their comrades to join them, and demanded that the present parliament should be speedily dissolved; that for the future no person or body should share sovereign power with the house of commons; that parliament should be triennial; that the suffrage should be equally distributed over the country according to population and taxation; that no member should be capable of being elected to two successive parliaments, no citizen imprisoned for debt, or compelled to serve in the army or navy, or excluded from any office merely on account of his religion; that the provinces should appoint all their own magistrates; that the civil law, equal for all, should be reformed and recast in a single code; finally, that certain rights, above all, liberty of conscience, should be declared inviolable, and superior to all human power.¹

At this declaration of popular ideas and hopes, the uneasiness of the leaders was extreme; many of them, and these the more intelligent, though enemies to the court and to the presbyterians, regarded royalty and the upper house as so potent, so deeply rooted in the traditions, laws, and manners of the people, that a republic, now at length seen near at hand, close impending, had the effect of a perilous chimera. Among the republicans themselves, the majority, though sincere and daring, were far from participating in all the views of the soldiers; some, with influence in the elections for their town or county, feared that a new system would deprive them of their preponderance; others, who had got possession of church property, heard with terror the people express their indignation that this property should have been sold at so low a price, and demand that all such sales should be annulled; the lawyers were anxious to retain their influence and their profits; all these classes and others vehemently opposed the idea of the house being dissolved, and their cause being left to the chances of a new election. Their common sense, moreover, revolted at the little social importance, the insane mysticism, the haughty insubordination of the reforming soldiers. How establish a government, in the face of the royalists and presbyterians, with an ungovernable

faction, senseless enough to put in jeopardy, day after day, the union with the army, its only support? How assailable, for the sake of the reveries of obscure sectarians, all the traditions, all the ancient and respected rights of England? Yet these same reveries were exciting in the minds of the lower classes, in almost every part of the kingdom, a fermentation, altogether unprecedented; those vague, glowing notions of absolute justice, those impassioned desires for equal happiness, which, often suppressed; are never extinguished in the heart of man, burst forth in all directions, with a blind and furious confidence; and the leaders themselves, who would not listen to, knew not how to answer them, for, at bottom, they shared the principles in whose name these wishes were proclaimed.

Their first proceedings were consequently feeble and fluctuating. Parliament voted that the two pamphlets were a crime against the government of the kingdom, and that it would prosecute their authors; but at the same time, to please the republicans, it declared that the king was bound to adopt whatever should be proposed to him by parliament (Nov. 6).¹ The general council of officers assembled at Putney (Oct. 22),² invited the principal agitators to join them, and a committee, in which several of them sat, received orders to draw up, without delay, a statement of their demands. In a short time, accordingly, the committee presented to parliament a report, embodying most of these demands; but the name and essential prerogatives of the king were equally set forth in it (Nov. 2).³ The agitators protested against this; they were promised that in an early council, the question whether monarchy was any longer to exist should be freely discussed. But when the day came, Ireton abruptly quitted the council, protesting that he would never re-enter it if such a question was even touched upon. The debate was adjourned till the following Monday, November 6th; and whether once more to evade it, or whether more compliance was hoped for from the soldiers in a body, it was agreed that the army should be summoned to a general meeting, at which it might give expression to its common sentiments.⁴

¹ Journals, &c. November 5th and 6th; Parl. Hist. iii. 785.

² Rushworth, ii. 4, 849

³ Ib. 861, &c.

⁴ Clarendon, State Papers, ii. App. x'i.; Letter of several agitators to their respective regiments; Godwin, ii. 451.

But Cromwell, who had proposed, easily discerned the danger of this remedy. Each fresh debate excited fresh disunion in the army; the more they were consulted, the more they shook off the government of their leaders and fell into anarchy.¹ To save, to make it of use, it was essential without delay to restore in it discipline, to regain over it command. Very determined steps were necessary to effect this. It was clear that the soldiers, at least the most active among them, the leaders and fanatics, were resolved to get rid of the king, that they would forsake, nay attack whosoever should appear favourable to him; that he alone would command their obedience and their strength, who should in this adopt their common will, and execute it. Cromwell formed his resolution. When the day of the council came, all debate was forbidden; the superior officers declared, that to re-establish harmony in the army it was necessary that all, officers and agitators, should return to their regiments; that instead of a general meeting, there should be three special meetings in the quarters of the principal divisions; and that, meanwhile, the council should suspend its sittings, and leave the general and the parliament to act.² The king's situation at Hampton Court was suddenly changed: his councillors, Richmond, Southampton, and Ormond, received orders to depart; his most trusty servants, Berkley and Ashburnham among others, were withdrawn from him; his guards were doubled; he no longer enjoyed the same liberty in his walks. From all sides dark hints reached him; it was said that the soldiers intended to seize his person and to take him from the officers as these had taken him from the parliament. Cromwell himself wrote on the subject, with uneasiness, to colonel Whalley, whether he really feared some attempt of the kind, or that he merely wished to alarm the king, or rather that, careful as ever to be prepared against all chances, he wished still to deceive him respecting his intentions and retain the appearance of a desire to serve him.³

These changes, these reports, so many new restrictions, a thousand rumours of treachery, of unprecedented designs, even of murder, threw the unhappy Charles into a state of anxiety each day more painful; his imagination, susceptible

Clarendon, *ut sup.* * Rushworth, ii. 4, 866. * Ib. ii. 4, 842; Holles, 167.

and vivid, though grave, was disturbed; a bad day's sport, a painful dream, the going out of his lamp in the night,¹ everything seemed to him an ominous presage; everything seemed to him possible at the hands of such enemies, though his pride refused to believe they would dare proceed to extremities. Flight was suggested to him; he was tempted to adopt the suggestion; but whither fly? how? with what aid? The Scottish commissioners offered to favour his escape. One day, while he was hunting, Lauderdale had it intimated to him that they were close by with fifty horse, and that if he would join them, they would depart at full speed for the north.² But sudden resolutions confused the king; besides, what asylum was he to look for in Scotland, which had already given him up, where he had no longer any means whatever of resisting the presbyterian yoke and the covenant? He refused. By another party he was advised to embark and retire to the isle of Jersey, where the facility of passing over to the continent would compel all parties to keep fair with him. But he still relied on the strength of their continued promises, on the good will of the officers; he flattered himself their coldness was only forced and counterfeit, that at the next meeting of the army they would get the better of the agitators, re-establish discipline, and renew their negotiations with him. He did not wish to leave England before this last trial.³ Yet the idea of flight became more and more familiar to him, more and more urgent; he was told that a German prophet had presented himself to the council of agitators, announcing that he was charged to reveal the will of heaven; but at the bare mention of reconciliation with the king, they had refused to hear him. In every possible way, Cromwell had it insinuated to him that flight was necessary. Some one, it is not known who, spoke to the king of the Isle of Wight as a convenient and safe asylum; it was near the mainland, its population was royalist; only just before, colonel Hammond, nephew of one of the king's most faithful chaplains, had been appointed its governor. Charles listened with more attention to this suggestion than to any other, collected information, and even made some pre-

¹ Herbert, 88.

² Burnet, *Memoirs of the Hamiltons*, 324.

³ Berkley, 47, &c.; Warwick, 307; Burnet, *Memoirs of the Hamiltons*, 326; Ludlow, 92.

parations.¹ Yet he still hesitated, and sought on all sides something to decide him. An astrologer, William Lilly, was at this time in high repute in London; inclined to the popular party, but refusing no one his predictions and advice. The king commissioned a woman, Mrs. Whorewood, to consult him in his name as to the place to which he had best retire; and out of a thousand pounds which had just been sent him by alderman Adams, a devoted royalist, Mrs. Whorewood received five hundred for her mission. The stars having been solemnly interrogated, Lilly answered, that the king should retire to the east, into Essex, twenty miles from London, and Mrs. Whorewood hastened back with this answer to Hampton Court.² Charles, however, had not waited for it; on the 9th of November, an anonymous letter, written as it would seem by a sincere friend, warned him that the danger was pressing; that within a few hours past, the agitators had resolved, in a nocturnal meeting, to make away with him, and that everything was to be dreaded if he did not immediately place himself out of their reach.³ Another letter warned him to beware of the guard which should be placed in charge of the castle⁴ on the next day but two. Struck with dismay, Charles took his resolution; on the 11th of November, at nine in the evening, leaving several letters on a table, and followed by a single valet-de-chambre, William Legge, he proceeded by a back staircase to a door which opened into the park on the side of the forest, where Ashburnham and Berkley, informed of his design, were in attendance with horses. They directed their course to the south-west; the night was dark and stormy; the king, who

¹ This is what evidently results from an account of the king's residence in the Isle of Wight, addressed, after the Restoration, to Charles II., by sir John Bowring, a man otherwise obscure, but who was at that time employed in the secret manœuvres of Charles I. I wonder this little work, though disfigured by many errors, and evidently written by a man solely intent upon making the most of himself, but which yet contains characteristic and curious details, should have escaped the attention of the English historians; Mr. Godwin is, as far as I know, the only writer who has mentioned it; it was taken from Lord Halifax's papers, and is to be found in a 12mo volume, entitled, *Miscellanies, Historical and Philological*, (London, 1708.) See also Rushworth, ii. 4, 951; Berkley, *ut sup.*

² William Lilly, *History of his Life and Times*. (1715), 60; *Biographia Britannica*, article Lilly.

³ Clarendon, *State Papers*, ii., Appendix, xii.

⁴ Berkley, 50.

alone was acquainted with the forest, served as a guide to his companions; they lost their way, and did not reach till day-break the little town of Sutton, in Hampshire, where, by the care of Ashburnham, a relay of horses was prepared for them. At the very inn where he awaited them, a committee of parliamentarians was assembled, deliberating on the affairs of the county. The party set off again immediately, and proceeded towards Southampton, but without the king's having expressly declared to what place he would go. On the descent of an eminence near the town: "Let us alight," said Charles, "and consult on what is best to be done." First, it is said, they talked of a vessel which Ashburnham was to have secured, and of which they had no news; then of turning into the western counties, where Berkley guaranteed the devoted support of many friends; at last of the Isle of Wight, a more convenient resolution than any other which presented itself at the time, removing the immediate perplexities of their situation, and evidently from the road they had taken, that which the king had proposed to himself when he came away. But the governor was not apprised: could he be trusted without security? It was arranged that Ashburnham and Berkley should proceed to the island, and after sounding Hammond, acquaint him with the mark of confidence he was on the point of receiving, and that the king should await their return a few miles distant, at Tichfield, a mansion occupied by lord Southampton's mother. They separated, and next morning the two cavaliers, landing in the island, went direct to Carisbrook Castle, the residence of the governor. Hammond was not there, but at Newport, the chief town of the place, whence, however, he was expected to return that day. Ashburnham and Berkley took the road to the town, and meeting Hammond, informed him, without preamble, of the purport of their coming. Hammond turned pale, the reins fell from his hands, his whole body trembled: "Oh, gentlemen," said he, "you have undone me by bringing the king into this island; if he is not yet landed, pray let him not come; for what between my duty to his majesty and my gratitude for this fresh obligation of confidence, and my observing my trust to the army, I shall be confounded." They endeavoured to calm him, enlarging upon the immense service he would render the king, and the engagements which

the army itself had contracted with his majesty, but intimating that if he did not coincide with them, the king was very far from desiring to force himself upon him. Hammond continued his lamentations. But when the two cavaliers, in their turn, appeared distrustful and about to withdraw their proposal, he exhibited less indecision, inquired where the king was, if he was not in danger, and even expressed some regret that he had not at once entirely trusted himself to him. The conversation was carried on for a long time, on either side with anxious caution, both parties almost equally afraid to break it off or to commit themselves. At length Hammond seemed to yield: "The king," he said, "shall not have to complain of me; it shall not be said I disappointed his expectations; I will act as a man of honour; let us go together, and tell him so." Berkley, still suspicious, would have evaded this proposal; but Ashburnham accepted it, and they immediately set out together, Hammond being accompanied only by one of his officers, named Basket. A boat conveyed them in a few hours to Tichfield, and on their arrival Ashburnham alone went up to the king, leaving Berkley, Hammond, and Basket in the court-yard of the castle. On hearing his story: "Oh, John! John!" exclaimed Charles, "thou hast undone me by bringing this governor here; dost thou not perceive that I can now not stir a foot without him?" In vain Ashburnham urged Hammond's promises, the good feeling he had displayed, his hesitation, a proof of his sincerity. The king, in despair, walked rapidly up and down the apartment, now with his arms folded, now raising hands and eyes to heaven with an expression of the deepest anguish; at length, Ashburnham, moved in his turn, said: "Sire, colonel Hammond is here with only another man; nothing is so easy as to make sure of him." "What," replied the king, "would you kill him? Would you have it said that he hazarded his life for me, and that I unworthily deprived him of it? No, no, it is too late to take any other course; we must trust to God." Meantime, Hammond and Basket, growing impatient, Berkley went to the king, and was directed to bring them up. Charles received them with an open and confiding air; Hammond renewed his promises, more extended even, though still vague and embarrassed. The day was declining; they embarked for the island. The report

that the king was at hand had already spread there; many of the inhabitants came to meet him; as he passed through the streets of Newport, a young woman advanced towards him and presented him with a red rose in full blow, notwithstanding the severity of the season, praying aloud for his deliverance. He was assured that the whole population was devoted to him, that even at Carisbrook Castle the entire garrison consisted of twelve veterans, all well disposed to him, and that he might at any time he pleased easily escape. Charles's terrors were gradually appeased; and next morning, when, on rising, he contemplated from the windows of the castle the charming view which the sea and land present from that spot, when he had breathed the morning air, when he saw in Hammond every demonstration of respect, when he received full permission to ride about the island at will, to retain his servants, to receive whom he pleased, his long troubled spirit once more felt a sense of security: "After all," he said to Ashburnham, "this governor is a gentleman; I am here out of reach of the agitators; I am in hopes I shall have to congratulate myself on the resolution I have adopted."¹

Berkley, 57, &c.; Herbert, 38; Ludlow, 94; Clarendon, iii. 118

BOOK THE EIGHTH.

1647—1649.

The rendezvous at Ware—Cromwell suppresses the agitators, and afterwards reconciles himself with them—The parliament sends to the king in four bills the preliminary conditions of peace—The king rejects them, and secretly treats with the Scots—The parliament resolves that it will have no further communications with the king—General discontent and reaction in favour of the king—Embarrassment of Cromwell and the independents—Breaking out of the second civil war—Fairfax's campaign in the east and round London, Cromwell's in the west, Lambert's in the north—Siege of Colchester—The Scots enter England—Cromwell marches against them—Battles of Preston, Wigan, and Warrington—Cromwell in Scotland—The presbyterians regain the ascendancy in London—The parliament again opens a treaty with the king—Negotiations at Newport—Changes in the situation of parties—The army carries off the king from the Isle of Wight—He is removed to Hurst castle—Then to Windsor—Last efforts of the presbyterians in his favour—Trial and death of the king—Monarchy abolished.

THE parliamentary commissioners and the officers of the garrison at Hampton Court waited for the king to appear at the supper table at the accustomed time; astonished at not seeing him, they at length went to his room, and there found only three letters in his own hand writing, addressed, one to lord Montagu, president of the committee, one to colonel Whalley, the third to the speaker of the house of lords. To the latter the king gave as the reason for his flight the plots of the agitators and his right to live free and in safety like any other citizen. The two other letters were merely to express to Montague and Whalley his thanks for their attentions, and to direct them what to do with his horses, dogs, pictures, and the minor articles of furniture in his apartments.

No indication was given as to the road he meant to take, nor the place of his retreat.¹

Great was the consternation in Westminster Hall, and all the greater that, concurrently with the news from Hampton Court, came a letter from head-quarters at Windsor, written at midnight by Cromwell, who had hastened, he said, to communicate the intelligence to parliament. He, then, had been the first to know of it, before parliament, perhaps before the king's departure; for a report became current that precisely on the 11th, the previously strict watch of the garrison at Hampton Court had been relaxed, that sentinels had even been withdrawn from the posts they usually guarded.² Letters soon came (Nov. 13) from Hammond, informing the house of the king's arrival,⁴ protesting entire devotion to their service, and requesting their instructions. Yet men's fears were not dispelled; Cromwell also had received letters from Hammond, as if all the servants of parliament thought themselves bound to give him information and consult him on every occasion; and he reported the letters and their contents to the house with an exhilaration of manner which astonished the least suspicious,⁵ and appeared to them even, an alarming symptom of some success, of the fulfilment of some hope, the nature of which they in vain attempted to discover.

Two days had scarcely elapsed before he inspired his enemies with other and still greater alarm. It was on Nov. 15th, that the first of the three appointed meetings of the army, which were to put an end to its dissensions, was to take place at Ware, in Hertfordshire. Cromwell proceeded thither with Fairfax, surrounded by the officers of whom he was sure. Only seven regiments were summoned, those which had shown the least excitement, and with whom it seemed most easy to re-establish discipline. Cromwell relied upon their subjection to intimidate, or upon their example to calm the more furious. But when they arrived on the common at Ware, the generals found nine regiments instead of seven; Harrison's regiment of cavalry, and Robert Lilburne's of infantry had come without orders, and in a state of the fiercest excitement. The latter had expelled all their officers above the rank of lieutenant, except captain Bray,

¹ Parl. Hist. iii. 786, &c.

² Rushworth, ii. 4, 871.

³ Indlow, 95.

⁴ Parl. Hist. iii. 789.

⁵ Clarendon, iii. 130.

who was now in command of them; every soldier wore on his hat a copy of *The Agreement of the People*, with this inscription: "Liberty for England, their rights for the soldiers." From time to time, as if seized with a common impulse, their shouts re-echoed over the plain: Rainsborough, Ewers, Scott, John Lilburne himself, lately permitted by the commons to leave the Tower every morning for the benefit of his health, galloped over the common, riding from troop to troop, encouraging the more animated, calling the moderate cowards, repeating everywhere that since the sword was in their hands, they were in conscience bound to use it, to secure fully and for ever the liberty of their country. Amidst this tumult, Fairfax, Cromwell, and their staff, advanced towards the peaceable regiments, and read to them, in the name of the general council of officers, a calm and firm remonstrance, reproaching the new agitators with their seditious proceedings and the dangers they brought upon the army; reminding them of the proofs of affection and fidelity their chiefs had given them, the triumphs they had obtained under their command, and promising to support the just demands of the soldiers in parliament, whether for themselves or their country, if, in their turn, they would sign an engagement to return under the laws of discipline, and henceforward respect the orders of their officers. Seven regiments received this address with joyful acclamations. Fairfax advanced towards that of Harrison. The troopers no sooner heard him repeat these promises, than they tore the copy of the agreement from their hats, and exclaimed that they had been deceived, and would live and die with their general. Lilburne's regiment still remained rebellious and violently excited; it even began to answer Fairfax by seditious shouts; Cromwell advanced: "Take that paper from your hats!" he cried to the soldiers; they refused; he suddenly entered among their ranks, and pointed out and caused to be arrested fourteen of the most mutinous: a court-martial was assembled on the spot, and three soldiers condemned to death. "Let them draw lots," the council ordered, "and let him upon whom it falls be shot instantly." It fell upon Richard Arnell, a wild agitator; the execution took place forthwith, in front of his regiment; the other two condemned men, with their eleven companions, were marched away. Major Scott and captain Bray were

put under arrest; deep silence prevailed; all the divisions returned to their quarters; the two other meetings passed over without the slightest murmur, and the whole army seemed once more under the full command of its leaders.¹

Cromwell, however, did not deceive himself respecting the uncertainty, the danger even, of such a triumph: when he announced it to the commons (Nov. 19),² amidst the thanks voted him by the majority, delighted at the defeat of the agitators, the presbyterian leaders did not conceal their coldness, nor the republicans their anger: to the first, any success of Cromwell's was matter of suspicion, whatever its apparent effect; the latter regarded his conduct at the meeting at Ware as another proof of treachery. Ludlow opposed the vote of thanks;³ the preacher, Saltmarsh, came up from the country, as he said, by an express command of God, to tell the generals that the Lord had forsaken them, since they had imprisoned his saints;⁴ in short, after the first stupor was over, a crowd of subaltern and noncommissioned officers, soldiers, nearly all the revolutionary agents of the regiments, declared to Cromwell and Ireton, that no severity, no temporary check should turn them from their designs; that they were resolved to get rid of the king, and establish a republic; that at the risk of losing all, they would divide the army, take with them at least two-thirds of it, and prosecute the enterprise alone rather than be thus put down. Cromwell had no desire to reduce them to this extremity; he had intended, by a signal example, to cut short the progress of anarchy in the army; but he knew the power of the fanatics, and was quite disposed to a reconciliation with them. Without declaring for a republic, he spoke ill to them of the king, acknowledged they were in the right to hope nothing from him, owned that for himself the vanities of this world had dazzled him for a moment, that he had not been able to discern clearly the work of the Lord, nor trust wholly to his saints, humbled himself before them, and implored the aid of their prayers to obtain his pardon from Heaven. The most popular preachers, among others Hugh Peters, an intriguing

¹ Rushworth, ii. 4375; Parl. Hist. iii. 791; Clarendon, iii. 132; Mazeres, Select Tracts, part 1, preface 33—73; Godwin, ii. 462.

² Whitlocke, 270.

³ Ludlow, 90.

⁴ Whitlocke, 285.

and prating enthusiast, undertook to spread abroad his protestations and admissions. Cromwell even sent comforting promises to the soldiers in prison. All he insisted upon, and this he did in the firmest tone, was the necessity of maintaining union and discipline in the army, as the only means of success or even of safety.¹ Many believed his words, ever impassioned and powerful; others, not so blind, felt how much they needed his talents, and even while doubting his repentance, could not make up their minds to reject it. Most of them, besides, confessed that the agitators had been too hasty, had gone too far, and that the soldiers owed to their officers more submission and respect. Rainsborough, Scott, and Ewers, admitted themselves in the wrong, and promised more prudence for the future. A great meeting took place at last at head-quarters (Dec. 22); officers, agitators, and preachers, passed ten hours together in conversation and prayer; the common interest prevailed over, without altogether dissipating, their mutual rancour and distrust; it was decided that the prisoners should be set at liberty, that captain Bray should return to his regiment, and that parliament should be requested to restore to Rainsborough the office of vice-admiral, which it had taken from him.² This reconciliation, of which the king's ruin was the condition, was celebrated by a solemn feast (Jan. 9, 1648).³

At this point of time, there arrived at head-quarters sir John Berkley, whom Charles, informed of the result of the meeting at Ware, had hastened to send to the generals, to congratulate them on their victory and to remind them of their promises (in the latter end of November). Though the bearer of letters not only from the king, but from Hammond to Fairfax, Ireton, and Cromwell, Berkley was not without uneasiness; he had met, on his road, with cornet Joyce, who had expressed astonishment at his temerity, and told him that the agitators, so far from fearing anything, had drawn over the generals to their views, and were preparing to bring the king to trial. When he arrived at Windsor, the council of officers was assembled; he presented

¹ Berkley, 75.

² Rushworth, ii. 4, 543; Clarendon, State Papers, ii.; Appendix, xlv.; Whitelocke, 285.

³ Rushworth, ii. 4, 950.

himself, and handed his letters to the general. He was ordered to withdraw. Recalled in half an hour, Fairfax sternly addressed him: "We are the parliament's army; we have no answer to give to the proposals of his majesty; our employers alone must judge of them." Berkley looked at Ireton, then at Cromwell; they scarcely bowed, and that with a smile of contempt. He withdrew quite astounded: the day passed without his being able to obtain an explanation or any intelligence; at length, towards the evening, the commandant Watson, the officer with whom he had been most intimate, sent him word to be at midnight in a certain paddock behind the Garter Inn, where he would meet him. From him, Berkley learned what had taken place, and with what ardour the army was transported: "It is such," he said, "that I hazard my life in coming here; for even this very afternoon, Ireton made two proposals; one to send you prisoner to London, the other to forbid any one to speak to you under pain of death. If the king can escape, let him do it, as he loves his life." "Do you advise me," said Berkley, "to send to Cromwell and Ireton the letters which the king has given me for them?" "By all means; otherwise they would distrust I had revealed their designs to you."¹

As Watson had foreseen, Berkley from the two generals obtained neither interview nor answer. "I will do my best to serve the king," Cromwell alone sent word; "but he must not expect I shall ruin myself for his sake." Sir John hastened to send this melancholy news to the king, conjuring him to get away without losing an instant. Charles, perhaps, might have done so; for a vessel, sent by the queen, had, it is said, been cruising about the island for several days past.² But a fresh intrigue had reanimated the king's hopes. After a warm debate in the commons,³ the house had just voted (Dec. 14) that four propositions should be presented to him in the form of bills; and that if he accepted them, he should be allowed, as he had several times requested, to treat in person with the parliament. They were—first, that the command of the sea and land forces should appertain, for

¹ Berkeley, 73.

² *Ib.* 76.

³ The motion took place in the house of lords on the 26th of November, and the commons adopted it on the 27th, by 115 to 106.—*Parl. Hist.* ii. 803.

twenty years to parliament, with power of continuation thereafter, if the safety of the kingdom should seem to require it; 2, that the king should revoke all his declarations, proclamations, and other acts published against the house, imputing to it illegality and rebellion; 3, that he should annul all the patents of peerage he had granted since he left London; 4, that Parliament should be empowered to adjourn for whatever time, and to whatever place, it should think proper. Charles, notwithstanding his distress, had no idea of sanctioning these bills, and thus acknowledging the legitimacy of the war which had brought him to this extremity; but he knew that the Scottish commissioners had strongly opposed them, that they had exhibited a bitter resentment of the contempt with which parliament had received their remonstrances:¹ he had received from them, concurrently with Berkley's letter, secret advice to reject propositions so offensive, and a promise that they would themselves come to the Isle of Wight and treat with him, in the name of Scotland, on far better conditions. "I must wait," he said to Berkley on his return; "I will settle with the Scots before I leave the kingdom; if they once saw me out of the hands of the army they would double their demands."²

Lords Lauderdale, Lowden, and Lanark, accordingly arrived at Carisbrook Castle, nearly at the same time (Dec. 23, 1647) with lord Denbigh and his five colleagues,³ the commissioners from Westminster. The negotiations already opened at Hampton Court were now renewed between them and the king with great mystery; for, they said, they had only to protest to him personally against the proposals of parliament. In two days the treaty was concluded, drawn up signed (Dec. 26), and hidden in a garden in the island until it could be taken away in safety. It promised the king the intervention of a Scottish army to re-establish him in his just rights, on condition that he would confirm the presbyterian establishment for three years in England, himself and his friends not being required to conform to it; and that, at the end of that term, the assembly of divines should be consulted, and he should definitively settle, in concert with parliament, the constitution of the church. Several stipula-

¹ Parl. Hist. iii. 825.² Berkley, 80.³ Parl. Hist. iii. 824.

tions to the advantage of Scotland, and which would have been highly offensive to the honour of England, accompanied this general concession. It was also agreed that to aid the Scottish army, the cavaliers all over the kingdom should take arms; that Ormond should go and reassume the command of the royalist party in Ireland, and that the king himself, as soon as he should have rejected the four propositions, should escape from the island and proceed to the borders of Scotland, to Berwick, or some other place, and wait in liberty for the moment of action.¹

Everything thus settled, Charles sent word to the parliamentary commissioners that he was ready to give them his answer (Dec. 27). He had resolved, three years before, in the negotiations at Oxford, to deliver it to them in a sealed envelope, fearing that, once aware of his refusal, perhaps even of his projects, they might take measures that would undo the whole. But lord Denbigh obstinately refused to receive the king's message in this form. "Parliament," he said, "has charged us to bring back, not anything it may please your majesty to give us, but the adoption or rejection of the four bills." Charles was obliged to comply, and read the message aloud: it absolutely rejected the propositions, and requested to treat in person, without being pledged to accept anything beforehand. The commissioners withdrew, held a short conference with Hammond, and returned to Westminster, and a few hours after their departure, while the king was discussing with Ashburnham and Berkley the means of escape prepared for the following night, the gates of the castle were closed, entrance forbidden to all strangers, the guards everywhere doubled, and almost all the king's servants, Ashburnham and Berkley the first, received orders to quit the island forthwith.²

Full of anger and painful uneasiness, Charles sent for Hammond: "Why," said he, "do you use me thus? Where are your orders for it? Was it the spirit that moved you to it?" Hammond, who had no formal orders, was silent, and hesitated; at last, he spoke of the answer his majesty had just made to the proposals of parliament. "Did you not engage your honour," said the king, "you would take no advantage

¹ Clarendon, iii. 151; Burnet, *Memoirs of the Hamiltons*, 325—334.

² Berkley, 92; *Parl. Hist.* iii. 828—830; Bowring, 92—94; Clarendon iii. 134.

against me in any case?" Hammond: "I said nothing." The king: "You are an equivocating gentleman. Will you allow me any chaplain? You pretend for liberty of conscience; shall I have none?" Hammond: "I cannot allow you any chaplain." The king: "You use me neither like a gentleman nor a christian." Hammond: "I will speak with you when you are in a better temper." The king: "I have slept well to-night." Hammond: "I have used you very civilly." The king: "Why do you not so now then?" Hammond: "Sir, you are too high." The king: "My shoemaker's fault, then; and yet my shoes are of the same last." This he repeated several times as he walked the room, then turning towards Hammond, he said: "Shall I have liberty to go about to take the air?" Hammond: "No, I cannot grant it." The king: "You cannot grant it: is this the faith you owe me? is this your allegiance?" Answer." Hammond hastily left the room, agitated and with tears in his eyes; but he in no respect altered his late arrangements.¹

Meantime, the parliamentary commissioners arrived at Westminster: they had no sooner given an account of their journey and its results, than a member, till then unnoticed in the house, sir Thomas Wroth, rose (Jan. 3, 1648): "Mr. Speaker," said he, "Bedlam was appointed for madmen, and Tophet² for kings; but our kings of late have carried them-

¹ Clarendon, State Papers, ii., Appendix, 44; Rushworth, ii. 4, 959, 960; Whitelocke, 286.

² That is to say, "Hell." Topheth is a Hebrew word, which, in its general acceptation, means an abominable thing, a thing worthy of execration (the radical word signifies, "to spit with disgust,") and as a proper name, it designates a place in the valley of Ben Hinnom, "the valley of the sons of lamentation," where sacrifices had long been offered to Moloch, and where the statues of the false gods were thrown, when their altars were demolished on the heights of Jerusalem, and which afterwards became a sort of receptacle for all the filth and impurities of the town, and where the bodies of executed criminals were burnt. It is in this sense that the prophet Isaiah, menacing with utter ruin Sennacherib and his army, says, (chap. xxx. 33,) "*For Tophet is ordained of old; yea, for the king it is prepared,*" &c. Yet some ancient divines, among others St. Jerome and the Chaldean paraphrast, simply understood by Topheth, "Hell," "Gehenna;" and after them, Calvin and the theologians of the Reformation, have given no other acceptation to this word. It is in this sense that it is employed in the English version of the Bible, that it is used by Milton (Par. Lost, book i. lines 392, 493—495), and the writers of his time; and sir Thomas Wroth alluded to this passage in Isaiah, which was at that time, as well as all other Scripture texts, present to the memory of most of his auditors.

selves as if they were fit for no place but Bedlam; I propose we lay the king by, and settle the kingdom without him. I care not what form of government you set up, so it be not by kings or devils." Ireton immediately supported the motion. "The king," he said, "has denied safety and protection to his people by denying the four bills; subjection to him is only in exchange of his protection to his people; this being denied by him, we may as well deny any more subjection to him, and settle the kingdom without him." Astounded at so rough an attack, irritated themselves by the king's refusal, the presbyterians appeared for awhile perplexed and timid; several members, however, spoke against the proposition: "To adopt it," said Maynard, "is, as far as in us lays, to dissolve the parliament; when kings have refused to receive our petitions, or admit our addresses, this has always been held the highest breach of our privileges, because it tended to our dissolution without dissolving us; and if we now, on our parts, determine we will receive no more messages from him, nor make any more addresses to him, we declare we are no longer a parliament." The discussion was prolonged and grew warm; the presbyterians regained confidence; the house, at first indifferently disposed towards them, seemed wavering; Cromwell rose: "Mr. Speaker," said he, "the king is a man of great sense, of great talents, but so full of dissimulation, so false, that there is no possibility of trusting him. While he is protesting his love for peace, he is treating underhand with the Scottish commissioners, to plunge the nation into another war. It is now expected the parliament should govern and defend the kingdom by their own power and resolution, and not teach the people any longer to expect safety and government from an obstinate man, whose heart God hath hardened; the men who, at the expense of their blood, defended you from so many perils, will again defend you, with the same courage and fidelity, against all opposition. Teach them not, by neglecting your own and the kingdom's safety, in which their own is involved, to think themselves betrayed, and left hereafter to the rage and malice of an irreconcilable enemy whom they have subdued for your sake, lest despair teach them to seek their safety by some other means than adhering to you, who will not stick to yourselves. And how destructive such a resolution in them will be to you all, I tremble to think,

and leave you to judge;" and he sat down with his hand on his sword hilt. No one spoke after him; the motion, immediately adopted (by 141 to 92), was sent the next day to the upper house (Jan. 4). At first, the lords appeared to hesitate; the debate was twice adjourned (from Jan. 4 to 8; then from 8 to 11): two declarations came from the army;¹ one addressed to the commons, full of congratulations, and threats against their enemies; the other to the lords, mild, conciliatory, contradicting the reports spread abroad as to danger threatening the peerage, and promising to support it in all its rights. The cowardly portion of the house could as they pleased appear alarmed or reassured; the discussion was brought to a close, and when the motion was put (Jan. 15), lords Warwick and Manchester alone opposed it.²

On the other hand, energetic and formidable protests were sent forth from all parts of the kingdom. "Now at last," cried the cavaliers, "are fulfilled those accusations and predictions so often treated as chimeras or calumnies;" and on all sides, crowds of voices hitherto wavering, joined them in denouncing this execrable treason. Before there was time for the king to answer the declarations of parliament, several answers appeared, emanating from the spontaneous zeal of private citizens.³ Never had so many reports of royalist plots, never had so many and such violent pamphlets besieged Westminster.⁴ In the Isle of Wight itself, captain Burley, a half-pay naval officer, had the drum beat through the streets of Newport, and, collecting a body of labourers, children, and women, put himself at their head to go and release the king from prison. The attempt was immediately frustrated, and Burley hanged as guilty of having made war against the king in his parliament.⁵ Similar feelings and desires agitated those counties which, just before, had been opposed to the royal cause; even at the very doors of parliament, some of Essex's disbanded soldiers tumultuously assem-

January 11th; they are dated the 9th.

¹ Parl. Hist. iii. 830—837; Clement Walker, *History of Independency*, (1648), 72; Clarendon, iii. 142.

² Clarendon, iii. 144.

³ Rushworth, 4, 522, 974, 1002; two pamphlets, more particularly, entitled "The Parliament's Ten Commandments," and "The New Testament of our Lords and Saviours the House of Commons sitting at Westminster," caused great excitement.

⁵ Clarendon, iii. 137.

bled, crying: "God save the king!" stopping the coaches and making those within join them in drinking his health.¹ The republicans were incensed at finding themselves thus disturbed in their victory: in vain they obtained addresses of congratulation² from a few counties; in vain the commons proclaimed their design of reforming the law, and of rendering the attainment of justice less expensive; in vain did they even suspend their own privileges in reference to prosecutions and debts (Jan. 4).³ These important ameliorations were only desired and appreciated by the party itself, or a few superior minds; some of them shocked the prejudices of the people, others were not understood by their ignorance; with all, the interested motive which seemed to dictate them destroyed their effect. This want of popularity must be made up for by tyranny. The proceedings already commenced against such members of parliament and city magistrates as were considered authors or fomenters of presbyterian or royalist riots, were urged forward;⁴ whoever had borne arms against parliament received orders to leave London, and were forbidden to reside within twenty miles of its walls (Dec. 17, 1647);⁵ a general revision of the justices of the peace throughout the kingdom was directed, with the view of getting rid of all whose principles should be suspected;⁶ it was enacted that no delinquent, no person who had taken any part or was accused of having taken a part in any plot against the parliament, might be elected a lord mayor, alderman, or member of the common council of the city, or even vote at the election of these magistrates (Dec. 17);⁷ the same disqualification was shortly after applied to the functions of jurymen and to the election of members of parliament.⁸ The committee appointed to suppress the licentiousness of the press received orders to sit every day, and a sum was put at their disposal (Jan. 6, 1648),⁹ to reward those who should discover and seize the presses of the malignants. Finally, the army once more marched through London with all the paraphernalia of war, and three

¹ Parl. Hist. iii. 804.

² Rushworth, ii. 4, 873.

³ Parl. Hist. iii. 830; Rushworth, ii. 4, 880.

⁴ Rushworth, ii. 4, 922; Parl. Hist. iii. 838—842.

⁵ Rushworth, ii. 4, 933.

⁶ Ib. 920.

⁷ Ib. 934.

⁸ Ib. 1252.

⁹ Ib. 957.

thousand men were detached from it and quartered, half at Whitehall half at the Tower.¹

The fanatics, the men of stern, narrow mind, the populace of the party, congratulated themselves on these measures as signal proofs of their strength, and redoubled their ardour. Cromwell alone, though co-operating in, felt uneasy about them, not from any scruple, nor that he hesitated at anything tending to success; but, despite his resolutions against the king, the hopes and pretensions of the republicans and enthusiasts appeared to him insane. Throughout the country he saw the principal freeholders, the rich citizens, almost every person of any note, retiring from public affairs, forsaking the committees of management and local magistracies, and power passing into the hands of people of an inferior condition, eager to seize it, capable of exercising it with vigour, but ill-fitted to retain it. He could not believe that England would long consent to be thus governed, or that anything at all permanent could be founded on the legal oppression of so many and such considerable citizens, nor that the discord and anarchy daily increasing in parliament and under its sway, could end otherwise than in the destruction of the conquerors. His indefatigable imagination was set to work to find out some means of putting an end to this state of things, or at least to discover in this dark chaos his own quickest and safest road to greatness. He assembled, one day at dinner at his house, the principal independents and presbyterians, clerical and lay, and earnestly expatiated on the necessity of conciliation, or at least of suspending their quarrels, in order to face together the new dangers it was easy to see were impending. But the humour of the presbyterians was too unbending, and their theological pretensions too exclusive to admit of such combinations. The conference was without result. Cromwell got up another of some political leaders, most of them general officers like himself, and the republicans. It was necessary, he said, that they should in concert investigate what government best suited England, as it was now their part to regulate it; but, in reality, he aimed at discovering which among them was likely to hold out, and what he had to expect or fear from them. Ludlow,

¹ Journals of the House of Commons, January 27, 1648; Walker, 72, 79.

Vane, Hutchinson, Sidney, and Haslerig, loudly declared their feelings, rejecting all idea of a monarchy as condemned by the Bible, by reason, and by experience. The generals were more reserved; according to them, a republic was desirable, but its success doubtful; it was better to come to no sudden determination, but to watch the progress of things, the necessities of the times, and obey from day to day the directions of Providence. The republicans insisted upon an unequivocal declaration. The discussion grew warm; Ludlow, among others, pressed Cromwell hard to declare himself, for they were resolved, he said, to know who were their friends. Cromwell evaded the point for awhile, till, at last, urged more and more, he suddenly rose, and, with a forced jest, hastily quitted the room, flinging as he went out a cushion at Ludlow's head, who sent another after him, "which," says Ludlow, "made him hasten down stairs faster than he desired."¹

Meantime, the danger drew nigh; the number and boldness of the malcontents increased every day: not only in the west and north, but around London, in Middlesex, Essex, Surrey, and Kent, at the table of some rich gentleman, at the assizes, at the markets, in every place where the cavaliers could concert or mix with the people, royalist petitions, plans, and insurrections, were got up and openly announced. At Canterbury, on Christmas day, as the mayor was endeavouring to enforce the ordinance which suppressed that festival, a violent tumult arose, amid the cry: "God, king Charles, and the county of Kent!" The city arsenal was broken open, several houses of parliamentarians attacked, the municipal officers very roughly handled, and, but for the prompt arrival of some troops, the peasants of the neighbourhood would have joined the movement and carried it out.² In London, one Sunday in church time, some apprentices were playing at bowls in Moorfields (April 9, 1648); a guard of militia ordered them to disperse, they resisted, and beat off the militia; routed in their turn by a detachment of cavalry, they spread all over the city, calling to their aid their companions and the Thames watermen; numerous bands assembled in every direction; they met in the night, took two of the gates

¹ Ludlow, 103.

² Rushworth, ii. 4, 948.

of the city by surprise, stretched chains across the streets, and with drums beating and shouts of "God and king Charles," attacked the Mansion-house, got possession of a cannon, then of a magazine of arms, and at daybreak seemed masters of the city. A council of war had sat all night; they hesitated to attack the rebels; they questioned whether the two regiments quartered in London would be sufficient, whether it would not be best to await reinforcements. Fairfax and Cromwell decided for an immediate attack: it was as immediately successful; in two hours nothing was to be heard in the streets but the regular step of the troops returning to their quarters.¹ But though they had fled, the people were not conquered; every day some unexpected event happened to augment their anger and raise their courage; the presbyterian members and city aldermen, when brought by the commons before the upper house, obstinately refused to acknowledge its jurisdiction, to kneel at the bar, or even to take off their hats and listen to the reading of the charges; and every time they appeared at Westminster, the multitude, as they came forth, hailed them with transport.² Public meetings were forbidden; the committee of management of each county was empowered to arrest and commit to prison all the disaffected—nay, all the suspected (April 18);³ but public excitement made more rapid progress than tyranny: at Norwich, Bury St. Edmunds, Thetford, Stowmarket, and a multitude of other places, upon the slightest pretext, the drum beat, the inhabitants flew to arms, and the troops did not always find a mere menacing display answer the purpose of repression.⁴ They had soon, moreover, other things to dread than mere riots, mere citizen mobs. In Pembrokehire, South Wales, captains Poyer and Powell and major-general Langhorn, distinguished officers, who had made their way in the parliamentary army, forsook it (towards the end of Feb.),⁵ raised the royal standard, and supported by the cavaliers of the district, saw the whole country in a few days in their power. At about the same time, the Scottish parliament met (March 2). Hamilton and the royalists,

¹ Rushworth, ii. 4, 1061; Whitelocke, 209; Parl. Hist. iii. 876.

² Parl. Hist. iii. 844, 874, 877, 880, 881.

³ Rushworth, ii. 4, 1062.

⁴ Rushworth, ii. 4, 1071, 1119; Journals, Lords, May 19th; Journals, Commons. June 12th.

⁵ Rushworth, ii. 4, 1010.

masked by an alliance of the moderate presbyterians, had prevailed in the elections; in vain had Argyle and the more violent of the clergy endeavoured to thwart them; as vainly had commissioners from London lavishly distributed money and threats in Edinburgh; circumspect, even humble in its language to the fanatics, but in reality favourable to the king, the parliament immediately voted (May 3) the formation of a committee of danger invested with the executive power, and the levy of an army of forty thousand men, charged to defend, against the republicans and sectaries, the covenant and royalty.¹ The cavaliers in the north of England only awaited this signal to break out. For more than a month past their principal leaders, Langdale, Glenham, and Musgrave, had been living in Edinburgh, sometimes openly and sometimes in secret, concerting with Hamilton their plan of insurrection. In Ireland, lord Inchiquin, lord-lieutenant of the province of Munster, and hitherto the surest support of parliament against the insurgents, also went over to the king's standard.² Finally, when all this news came to London, the presbyterians, both in parliament and in the city, raised their heads: and to cover their hopes, made a loud outcry about their fears. A man named John Everard, came and made oath to the common council (April 23) that, two nights before, being in bed at the Garter inn at Windsor, he had heard in the adjoining room, several officers, among others quarter-master-general Grovenor and colonel Ewers, promise each other that the moment the Scots set foot in the kingdom the army should enter the city, disarm all the citizens, exact from them a million sterling under pain of pillage, and send, moreover, at the city expense, all the well-disposed they could collect, to the various regiments. According to Everard, Ireton was acquainted with this design.³ Hereupon a petition was forthwith drawn up and presented to the house (April 27); in it the common council required that the city should again be put in possession of its chains, which had been taken from it after the late riots, that the army should remove its headquarters to a greater distance, and that all the forces in London

¹ Baillie, *Letters*, ii. 281; Rushworth, ii. 4, 1040; *Idem*, iii. 394—400.

² Rushworth, ii. 4, 1060, 1063; Carte, *Life of Ormond*, ii. 23; Clarendon, iii. 160.

³ *Parl. Hist.* iii. 881.

and the suburbs should be placed under the command of Skippon. These demands were immediately granted; and the next day, the 28th of April, after a debate of which no record exists, the commons voted: 1, that they would not change the fundamental government of the kingdom by king, lords, and commons; 2, that the proposals made to the king at Hampton Court should be made the basis of the measures it was essential to adopt to re-establish public peace; 3, that, notwithstanding the vote of the preceding 3rd of January, forbidding any further address to the king, every member should be at liberty to propose what he should think requisite for the good of the country.¹

For three weeks Cromwell had foreseen and endeavoured to prevent this reverse: in the name of the leaders of the army and of the party, he had caused an offer to be made to the common council (April 18), that the command of its militia and of the Tower should be restored to the city, and that the accused aldermen should be set at liberty, if it pledged itself to take no part in aid of the Scots in their approaching invasion; but his offers had been rejected.² Compelled to resign all hopes of conciliation, when he saw the presbyterians regaining courage in the city and credit in the parliament, he was filled with a passionate desire to risk a decisive blow. He went to head-quarters, assembled the council of officers, and proposed that the army should march upon London, expel all their adversaries from parliament, and in a word, take full possession of power in the name of the well affected and of the public safety. In the first instance, the council was about to adopt the proposal, but so violent an attack on the rights of a parliament, long the idol and master of the country, still alarmed the boldest; they hesitated. Fairfax, who began to be uneasy at what he was doing, took advantage of this, and resisted the entreaties of the lieutenant-general, who wished to give orders for the movement at once; the project was abandoned.³ Discomfited by this second failure, suspected by some for his endeavours at accommodation, by others for the violence of his designs, Cromwell, unable to endure such inaction, such embarrassment, resolved at once to leave London, to march and fight the insurgents in the

¹ Parl. Hist. iii. 882, 883.

² Walker, 83.

³ Fairfax, 110.

west, and regain by war the ascendancy he felt he was losing. He easily obtained this mission from the parliament. While the troops which were to accompany him were making their preparations for departure, he one day complained to Ludlow of his situation, went over all he had done for the common cause, what perils, what enmity he had braved, and exclaimed against the ingratitude of his party. Ludlow listened to his complaints, and reminded him, in his turn, of the grounds he had given for distrust, pressed him to renounce intrigue and ambition, and upon this condition promised him the cordial support of the republicans, and was delighted with the docile attention his exhortations had obtained.¹ A few days after, at the head of five regiments, Cromwell took his departure for Wales, and almost at the gates of London, at a meeting previously arranged, some presbyterian ministers had a conference with him, from which they retired equally satisfied.²

He was no sooner gone, than the war he went to seek broke out on all sides round parliament: the cavaliers had, indeed, agreed among themselves to attempt nothing till the Scots had entered the country; but every day, in one place or other, the popular impulse, a favourable opportunity, some unexpected and apparently imperative circumstance, precipitated the insurrection. Some inhabitants of Essex had petitioned that negotiations should be re-opened with the king, and the army disbanded, after the payment of arrears (May 4).³ Following their example, seven or eight hundred gentlemen, freeholders, and farmers of Surrey, repaired to London (May 18), bearing a similar petition; but its tone was far more haughty; it required that the king, recalled to Whitehall, should be replaced on his throne with the splendour of his ancestors; and when they arrived at Westminster, as they were passing through the ante-rooms, some of them, addressing the soldiers, said: "Why stand you there to guard a company of rogues?" The soldiers warmly resented this affront; a quarrel arose, the soldiers were disarmed and one of them killed. A reinforcement of troops arrived; and the petitioners, charged in their turn, pursued from passage to passage, from hall to hall, from street to

¹ Ludlow, 105.² Hutchinson, 288.³ Rushworth, ii. 4, 1101.

street, did not, however, fly till after a vigorous resistance, leaving five or six of their number dead at the doors of parliament.¹ On hearing this, the royalists of Kent, who were also preparing a petition, formed themselves into divisions of foot and horse, chose officers, appointed places of rendezvous, made Goring, earl of Norwich, their general, took possession of Sandwich, Dover, and several forts, and assembled at Rochester (May 29), to the number of more than seven thousand, mutually engaged to march together and in arms to present their petition to parliament.² As soon as the banner of revolt was raised upon this pretext, others openly unfurled it, without taking the trouble of drawing up, in the form of petition or otherwise, their grievances and their wishes. Sir Charles Lucas in Essex, lord Capel in Hertfordshire, sir Gilbert Byron in the neighbourhood of Nottingham, openly raised troops for the king's service. Parliament heard that, in the north, in order to open the way for the Scots into the kingdom, Langdale and Musgrave had surprised, and now occupied, the one Berwick, the other Carlisle.³ Some symptoms of excitement also appeared in the fleet stationed in the Downs; Rainsborough, who was vice-admiral, set off immediately to repress it; but the sailors refused to receive him (May 27), put all their officers in a boat, sent them on shore, declared for the king, and without any leader above the degree of boatswain, sailed for Holland, where the duke of York, who had lately succeeded in making his escape from St. James's, and soon after the prince of Wales himself, took the command of them.⁴ Even in London, men were privately enlisted, royalist oaths circulated, and armed bands passed through the city to join the insurgents;⁵ the houses of the earl of Holland and of the young duke of Buckingham were at all hours filled with malcontents, who came to inquire on what day, at what place, they were to assemble in arms.⁶ In every direction, in short, the insurrection, like an un-

¹ Rushworth, ii. 4, 1116; Parl. Hist. iii. 886; Whitelocke, 300; Ludlow, 103.

² Rushworth, ii. 4, 1130.

³ Rushworth, ii. 4, 1099, 1105.

⁴ Clarendon, iii. 204; Parl. Hist. iii. 896, 899, 900; Godwin, Hist. of the Commonwealth, ii. 531—533, 551—556.

⁵ Rushworth, ii. 4, 1117, 1174; Parl. Hist. iii. 892—893.

⁶ Whitelocke, 817; Clarendon, iii. 264.

quenchable conflagration, raged and extended, still more and more closely pressing upon Westminster; all the efforts of the committee of Derby House, where the independents prevailed, all the skill of Vane and St. John, in finding out informers and unravelling plots,¹ did not prevent the cry of "God and king Charles!" from sounding constantly in the ear of parliament.

The presbyterians themselves took alarm; the Scots, their firmest support, did not arrive; they found themselves on the point of falling into the hands of the cavaliers, the sole masters of this new movement, and who having no better liking for presbyterian doctrines and intentions than for any others, indiscriminately denounced the whole parliament, demanded the laws and the king of old England, insultingly defied the austere rigors of the new form of worship, openly practised forbidden games, celebrated suppressed festivals, and raised once more the maypoles.² Harmond sent word that the king had been on the point of effecting his escape (May 31);³ and the most moderate shuddered with fear at the thought of his appearing all at once at the gates of London at the head of these thousands of insurgents: party hatreds, the desire for peace, alarm for the future, all gave way before this great danger. To deprive the rebellion of its most specious pretexts, negotiations with the king were again voted (May 8 and 24);⁴ the aldermen of the city were fully acquitted (May 23);⁵ Skippon took the command of the militia, colonel West that of the Tower, from which he had been removed by Fairfax (May 18);⁶ and an ordinance against heresy and swearing, which authorized even the infliction of death in certain cases, attested the return of presbyterian ascendancy;⁷ But, at the same time, all idea of concession or forbearance towards the cavaliers was sternly rejected; a fresh order was issued, banishing from London, under still more severe penalties than before (May 28),⁸ all papists and malignants; the property of delinquents was appropriated to paying the debts due to the friends of the good cause (May 11);⁹ the sale of

¹ Parl. Hist. iii. 887—892.

² Whitelocke, 305.

³ Parl. Hist. iii. 899—900, 921—928; Clarendon, iii. 353.

⁴ Parl. Hist. iii. 885—892.

⁵ Ib. 891.

⁶ Rushworth, ii. 4, 1118.

⁷ Journals, Lords.

⁸ Rushworth, ii. 4, 1124.

⁹ Ib. 1110.

church lands was hastened;¹ reinforcements were sent to the garrison of Carisbrook (towards the end of May);² the common council, after having received communications which were to it, it said, "as a beam of light piercing through dark clouds," solemnly protested that it was resolved to live and die with the parliament (May 20).³ Finally, Fairfax received orders immediately to open a campaign against the bands who infested the neighbourhood of London; Lambert to march to the north, to repress, at all events, the insurrection that Langdale and Musgrave had raised while waiting for the arrival of the Scots; and by a violence till then unheard of, doubtless to prove the sincerity of their rigorous proceedings, the commons voted that the king's presence no longer affording an excuse for the rebels, no quarter should be given them (May 11).⁴

Three days after his departure from Windsor (June 1), Fairfax had come up to and beaten, at Maidstone, the principal body of the insurgents; in vain had they sought to avoid so sudden an encounter; in vain, when obliged to fight, had they maintained, in the streets of the town, a long and bloody⁵ conflict. Still animated by the most ardent fanaticism, inured to war, detesting the cavaliers, and despising their new recruits, Fairfax's soldiers passionately pressed forward a war the danger of which seemed almost an insult. They traversed by forced marches the county of Kent, daily dispersing some gathering or retaking some place, rough in their demeanour towards the country, but exact in their discipline, and allowing the royalists neither refuge nor repose. Goring, nevertheless, succeeded in again assembling three or four thousand men, and appeared at their head on Black-

¹ Harris, *Life of Cromwell*, 308.—In the course of the years 1647, 1648, 1649, 1650, and 1651, there was sold property belonging—

| | | | |
|--------------------------------------|---------|----|----|
| To the see of York, to the amount of | £55,780 | 7 | 1½ |
| — the see of Durham | 68,121 | 15 | 9 |
| — the see of Carlisle | 6,440 | 11 | 2 |
| — the see of Chester | 1,120 | 18 | 4 |

Total . . . £141,487 12 4½

² Rushworth, ii. 4, 1130.

³ Parl. Hist. iii. 890.

⁴ Journals, Commons.

⁵ Rushworth, ii. 4, 1137; Parl. Hist., iii. 902; Ludlow, 107.

heath (June 3), almost at the gates of London, incited by the hope that an insurrection would break out at his approach, or that at least he should receive some secret assistance. He even wrote to the common council, requesting leave to pass through the city in order to proceed quietly with his men into Essex. But the council, so far from sending him an answer, forwarded, without opening it, his letter to the commons, prepared, it sent word, to regulate its conduct in all things according to their wishes.¹ Upon hearing this the cavaliers grew dispirited, and disorder spread among them; they deserted in troops, and Goring had great difficulty in collecting a sufficient number of boats for them to cross the Thames at Greenwich with seven or eight hundred men, who followed him into Essex. There he found the insurrection, under the direction of sir Charles Lucas, still powerful and confident. Lord Capel joined them with a troop of cavaliers from Hertfordshire; they marched together to Colchester (June 12), with somewhat raised spirits, intending to rest there for a day or two and then overrun together Suffolk and Norfolk, raise the royalists as they went, and march upon London through Cambridge at the head of a numerous army. But they had scarcely entered the town, when Fairfax appeared under the walls and closely invested it (June 13). A fortnight's campaign had thus sufficed to enclose in one town, almost without means of defence, the wreck of the insurrection which had so lately surrounded London on all sides. The insurgents endeavoured to rally at several points, in the counties of Rutland, Northampton, Lincoln, and Sussex.² In the city itself, under the eyes of parliament, lords Holland, Peterborough, and Buckingham, took arms; and, followed by about a thousand cavaliers, marched out of London (July 5), proclaiming that they had no design of sacrificing public liberty to the king, and only desired to restore to him his legal rights. But while they were still in the neighbourhood of the metropolis, sir Michael Livesey, who had been sent from head-quarters against them, suddenly attacked them (July 7), killed several of their officers, among others the young sir Francis Villiers, brother to the duke of Buckingham, and reinforced next day

¹ Rushworth, ii. 4, 1130; Whitelocke, 309; Ludlow, *ut sup.*

² Rushworth, ii. 4, 1135, 1145, 1149, 1150, 1169; Ludlow, i. 300.

by colonel Scrope's regiment, pursued them without respite into Huntingdonshire, where, weary of this constant retreating, they dispersed in all directions, leaving lord Holland wounded in the hands of the enemy (July 10).¹ In the east and south, similar attempts had no better result. Letters were received from Cromwell (June 16), promising that in a fortnight Pembroke Castle, the bulwark of the insurgents in the west, would be in his power.² In the north, Lambert, though with inferior forces, valiantly maintained the honour and authority of parliament against Langdale's cavaliers.³ Finally, Colchester, notwithstanding the indomitable resistance of the besieged, alike unmoved by offers and by attacks, was assailed by famine, and could not hold out long against Fairfax, who had nothing else to attend to.⁴

Freéd from their first anxiety, sure of not falling a prey to the cavaliers, the presbyterians again began to feel uneasy about the independents and the army, and to meditate peace. The petitions in favour of it, still numerous though less imperious, were now better received.⁵ The proscription of the eleven members was revoked, and they were invited to resume their seats (June 8).⁶ New proposals to the king, less rigorous than the former, were talked of; a disposition was shown to resume negotiations with him, if he would consent—1, to repeal all his proclamations against the parliament; 2, to give up to it for ten years the disposal of the sea and land forces; 3, to establish throughout the kingdom the presbyterian church for three years (June 6).⁷ A special committee (June 26)⁸ was appointed to consider the best mode of attaining the desired object, and at what time, in what place, and in what form it would be proper to treat. One member even inquired whether it would not be desirable for the king immediately to return to Windsor;⁹ and upon a petition to that effect from the city, (June 27), the lords voted that the conferences should be held at London.¹⁰

¹ Rushworth, ii. 4, 1178, 1180, 1182, 1187; Parl. Hist. iii. 925—927; Ludlow, 110; Clarendon, iii. 266.

² Rushworth, ii. 4, 1159.

³ Ib. 1167; Clarendon, iii. 228.

⁴ Rushworth, ii. 4, 1204; Whitelocke, *passim*.

⁵ Parl. Hist. iii. 921.

⁶ Ib. 907.

⁷ Ib. 904.

⁸ Rushworth, ii. 4, 1164.

⁹ Ib. 1162.

¹⁰ Journals, Lords.

Finally, on the 30th of June, the vote forbidding any further address to the king was rescinded;¹ and three days after, a motion was made in the house of commons that another treaty should be offered to the king without delay.

But the independents had also regained confidence; proud of the success of their soldiers, they violently opposed this motion: "No time," said Thomas Scott, "can be seasonable for such a treaty, or for a peace with so perfidious and implacable a prince; it will always be too soon or too late. He that draws his sword upon the king must throw his scabbard into the fire; all peace with him would prove the spoil of the godly." The presbyterians did not undertake to defend the king, but they declaimed against the pseudo-godly, who advocated war because war was conducive to their private fortunes: "The people," they said, "have been despoiled by war, and will no longer be made fuel to that fire wherein these salamanders live, nor any longer feed those horse-leeches, the army, their engaged party and servants, with their own blood and marrow." It was then asked where the negotiations were to be opened: the presbyterians contended for London or some place in the neighbourhood, the independents for the Isle of Wight, where Charles was in their power. "If you treat with this enraged king in London," said Scott, "who can secure the parliament that the city will not make their peace with him by delivering up your heads to him for a sacrifice, as the men of Samaria did the heads of the seventy sons of Ahab?" It was further said by colonel Harvey, "if the king promised to reside in one of his houses not nearer London than ten miles, what security would his word be that he would remain there till the treaty was concluded? the king's promise hath been broken over and over again; put no trust in princes." Several members spoke in support of this view, and among others Vane. Sir Symonds d'Ewes said: "I am quite of a contrary opinion; the house not only ought, but must trust the king; Mr. Speaker, if you know not in what condition you are, give me leave, in a word, to tell you it: your silver is clipped, your gold shipped, your ships are revolted, yourselves contemned; your Scots friends enraged against you, and the affection of the

¹ Parl. Hist. iii. 924.

city and kingdom quite alienated from you. Judge, then, whether you are not in a low condition, and also if it be not high time to endeavour a speedy settlement and reconciliation with his majesty?"¹ The independents vehemently protested against this address; but many members, strangers to faction and in the habit of supporting either party, according to circumstances, silently approved of what sir Symonds had said; parliament resolved that it was necessary to treat; but the house, contrary to the wish of the lords, persisted² (by eighty to seventy-two) in requiring from the king the adoption, in the first instance, of the three bills, and nothing was decided as to the place where negotiations should be opened.

Parliament and the common council were discussing the feasibility of their taking place in London, without danger to the king or parliament,³ when news arrived that the Scots had entered the kingdom (July 8),⁴ and that Lambert was retreating before them. Notwithstanding the intrigues of Argyle and the furious preaching of a part of the clergy, Hamilton had at last succeeded in raising and putting in motion an army. It did not correspond, it is true, to the first resolution of parliament; instead of forty thousand, it scarcely reckoned fourteen thousand men; the court of France had promised arms and ammunition; none had been received; the prince of Wales was to have crossed over to Scotland and taken the command: he still remained in Holland; even Langdale and Musgrave's cavaliers had not joined them, for they refused to take the covenant, and Hamilton could not place such misbelievers by the side of his soldiers, without ruining himself with his own party: they accordingly formed a separate body, which seemed to act only on its own account, and always at a distance from the Scots. In short, Hamilton's preparations, thwarted by so many obstacles, were not completed, nor his regiments full, nor his artillery in order, when the premature breaking out of the royalist insurrections in England obliged him to hasten his departure; and he left Scotland ill-provided, and pursued by the invectives of a multitude of fanatics, who prophesied the ruin of an army

¹ Walker, 108—110; Parl. Hist. iii. 922—924. ² Parl. Hist. iii. 924.

³ Rushworth, ii. 4, 1185. ⁴ Parl. Hist. iii. 931; Rushworth, ii. 4, 1189.

employed, they said, to restore the king to his rights before Christ was put in possession of his.¹

The news of the invasion none the less agitated all England; there seemed no means of resisting it; Fairfax was still kept before Colchester, Cromwell before Pembroke; insurrection scarcely repressed, might any hour break out again in all directions. The embarrassment of the presbyterians was extreme; the people, even those well disposed towards them, were as inveterate as ever against the Scots, only spoke of them with insult, recalled to one another how they had lately sold the king they now pretended to deliver, and demanded that, before anything else was done, these rapacious and lying foreigners should be driven from the kingdom. A motion was made in the house of commons (July 14)² declaring them public enemies, and all who had taken part in inviting them traitors; ninety members voted against the motion, but hesitatingly and without success; it was rejected, however, in the upper house (July 18).³ The lords resolved that the negotiations with the king should be hastened,⁴ and in the lower house the presbyterians (July 28, by 71 to 64),⁵ carried a motion no longer to insist upon the three bills previously made the preliminary condition of any treaty. But without troubling itself about these vicissitudes in the daily position of parties, the Derby-house committee, still under the influence of the independents, sent money and reinforcements to Lambert, ordered Cromwell to forward what troops he could spare to the north, and to march thither himself as soon as he should be at liberty; and the republican leaders themselves, humbling their distrust before his genius, wrote to him privately to fear nothing, but to act with vigour, and rely upon them, regardless of any opposition he might heretofore have met with at their hands.⁶

Cromwell had waited for neither orders nor promises; already a month since, well informed, perhaps by Argyle himself, of the condition and movements of the Scottish army, he had sent word to Lambert to fall back as soon as it ap-

¹ Rushworth, ii. 4, 1196—1198; Clarendon, iii. 222; Ludlow, 108; Laing, Hist. of Scotland, iii. 394.

² Parl. Hist. iii. 934.

³ Ib. 936.

⁴ Rushworth, ii. 4, 1195.

⁵ Parl. Hist. iii. 936.

⁶ Ludlow, iii.; Godwin, Hist. of the Commonwealth, ii. 591.

peared, to avoid an engagement, and that he would soon be ready to support him. And so it happened; Pembroke castle capitulated three days after the invasion (July 11); and two days after, Cromwell set out, at the head of five or six thousand men, ill shod, ill clad, but proud of their glory, irritated by their perils, full of confidence in their leader, of contempt for their enemies, eager to fight and certain of victory: "Send me some shoes for my poor tired soldiers," Cromwell wrote to Derby-house; "they have a long march to take."¹ And he traversed nearly all England, first from west to east, then from south to north, with a rapidity till then without example,² lavish, on his way, of protestations, of pious ebullitions, intent on dispelling suspicions, on gaining the hearts of the blindest fanatics, of enlisting the sympathies of his soldiers.³ Thirteen days after his departure, his cavalry, which had been sent in advance, had united with that of Lambert (July 27), and he rejoined it himself the 7th of August, at Knaresborough in Yorkshire, the two corps forming together nine or ten thousand men. Meantime, the Scots had advanced by the western road through Cumberland, Westmoreland, and Lancashire, but they were full of indecision, made long halts, were scattered over a line of fifteen or twenty miles, were internally agitated by religious, political, and military dissensions, and in complete ignorance of the enemy's movements. Suddenly, Langdale, who with the English insurgents was some way in advance of the main body, to the left, sent word to Hamilton that Cromwell was approaching, that he had certain information of it, and that everything announced on his part an intention of giving battle. "Impossible," replied the duke, "they have not had time to come; if Cromwell is so near, it is assuredly only with a very few men, and he will take good care not to attack us;" and he removed his head-quarters to Preston. Another message (Aug. 17) soon reached him; Langdale's cavalry was already engaged with Cromwell's; Langdale promised to hold out; his position was good, his men in spirits; he only wanted some reinforcements, a thousand men at least, and he would

¹ Rushworth, ii. 4, 1206.

* He took his road from Pembroke to Yorkshire, through Gloucester, Warwick, Nottingham, and Doncaster.

² Hutchinson, 288.

give the whole army time to rally and crush the enemy. Hamilton promised reinforcements; Langdale fought for four hours; by his own admission, Cromwell had never met with so desperate a resistance. But no assistance came, and the gallant cavalier was obliged to yield. Leaving the defeated English to an undisturbed retreat, Cromwell marched straight upon the Scots, who were hurrying across the Ribble to place this obstacle between him and them; most of the regiments were already on the other side; only two brigades of infantry and Hamilton himself with a few squadrons remained on the right bank to cover their retreat; Cromwell at once dispersed them, and, passing the river with them, and giving his troops but a short repose, continued next morning (Aug. 18) at daybreak his pursuit of them, still marching towards the south, and continuing, even in flight, their invading movement. He overtook them the same day at Wigan, fifteen miles from Preston, and cut their rearguard to pieces. The pride of two victories, the hope of a decisive triumph, the very impatience of fatigue, hourly augmented the courage of his soldiers; the pursuit was recommenced the next day (Aug. 19), and with even greater rapidity and determination. Irritated in their turn at being thus pressed upon by an inferior number, and meeting with an advantageous defile near Warrington, the Scots suddenly turned and faced them, and a third battle took place, longer and more bloody than the previous two, but with the same result. The English carried the defile, and afterwards, also at Warrington, a bridge over the Mersey, which the Scots were about to break down, in order to give themselves breathing time. Vociferous dismay now manifested itself in the Scottish army; a council of war declared that the infantry, being without ammunition, could no longer resist; it surrendered in a body. Hamilton, at the head of the cavalry, went off towards Wales, to revive the royalist insurrection there; but, suddenly changing his mind, he proceeded to the north-east, in the hope of being able to reach Scotland; but everywhere, as he passed, the peasantry rose in arms, and the magistrates summoned him to surrender; at Uttoxeter, in Staffordshire, on hearing a rumour that he purposed to escape with a few officers, his own cavalry mutinied; at this moment, Lambert and lord Grey of Groby, who had been sent in pursuit of

him, were close at hand; too faint-hearted to struggle against so adverse a fate, he (Aug. 25) left his men to surrender or disband at their pleasure, accepted himself the conditions proposed by Lambert, was sent prisoner to Nottingham, and after a fortnight's campaign, Cromwell, finding no trace of the Scottish army on English ground, marched towards Scotland to invade it in his turn, and thus wrest from the royalist presbyterians all means of action and of safety.¹

But in extreme peril, parties, so far from giving way, often become invigorated, and deal out their hardest blows. Even before this important intelligence reached Westminster, as soon as they saw Cromwell in movement against the Scots, the presbyterians clearly comprehended that his triumph would be their ruin, and that his downfall, or an immediate peace, could alone save them. They at once directed their most energetic efforts to secure both the one and the other of these objects. Holles, who, notwithstanding the recall of the eleven members, had hitherto continued to reside in France, on the coast of Normandy, came and resumed his seat in the house of commons (Aug 14).² Huntingdon, lately a major in Cromwell's own regiment, publicly denounced, in a memorial addressed to the upper house, the intrigues of the lieutenant-general, his promises first, and then his perfidy to the king, the audacity of his ambition, his contempt of parliament, of the laws, of the common duties and rights of men, the pernicious principles, the threatening designs which sometimes pierced through his hypocrisy, and broke out in his familiar conversations. The lords ordered the memorial to be read, and Huntingdon made oath of its truth (Aug. 8). He purposed likewise to present it to the commons, but so great was the terror already inspired by the name of Cromwell, that no member would take charge of it. He sent it in an envelope to the speaker; Lenthall did not mention it to the house; he attempted to give it to the sergeant-at-arms, but he refused to take it; the lords transmitted it officially to the commons; lord Wharton, one of Cromwell's most intimate confidants, followed the messengers out, sent

¹ Rushworth, ii. 4, 1237; Parl. Hist. iii. 997—1000; Laing, iii. 400—403; Godwin, ii. 563—572; Baker, A Chronicle of the Kings of England, &c. (1865), 606.

² Rushworth, ii. 4, 1226.

word to the speaker what they were coming with, and they were not admitted.¹ The independents vehemently denounced all these attempts against their general; they denounced it as base cowardice thus to attack an absent man, who was, perhaps at that very hour, delivering his country from foreign invasion, and many of the presbyterians themselves were intimidated by this argument. The idea of destroying the lieutenant-general in this direct manner was given up, and Huntingdon contented himself with having his memorial printed. The steps taken for the establishment of peace had more success: in vain did the independent leaders, particularly Vane and St. John, exhaust every stratagem to prolong the debates; in vain did their less refined colleagues, Scott, Venn, Harvey, and Weaver, give way to the fiercest language against their adversaries; this very violence, the daily increasing anarchy, the arrogance of the soldiers, the imperious tone of even the most pacific pamphlets and petitions, everything manifested to the house its own decline, everything led those who were not too deeply engaged in faction to desire peace. "Mr. Speaker," said Rudyard, one day, "we have sat thus long, and have come to a fine pass, for the whole kingdom is now become parliament all over; the army hath taught us a good while what to do, and would still teach us what we shall do; the city, the country, and reformadoes, teach us what we should do; and all because we ourselves know not what to do;"² and the majority thinking with him that peace alone could relieve them from its discreditable embarrassments, at last took their resolution, voted that fresh negotiations should be immediately opened with the king, agreed (July 29),³ to silence the independents, that they should take place in the Isle of Wight, and (August 2)⁴ charged three commissioners to proceed thither with a formal proposal to the king, requesting to know in what part of the island he would like to reside during the treaty, and which of his councillors he wished to have with him.

The independent leaders did not deceive themselves; this was a clear defeat. Finding the crisis approach, and more fearful of their triumph than of their threats, the majority had

¹ Parl. Hist. iii. 965; Whitelocke, 327.

² *Ib.* 957.

³ Parl. Hist. iii. 980.

⁴ Parl. Hist. iii. 964, 965.

manifestly passed over to their opponents. Ludlow directly proceeded to head-quarters, still before Colchester: "They are plotting," he said to Fairfax "to betray the cause for which so much blood has been shed; they will have peace at any price; the king, being a prisoner, will not think himself bound by his promises; even those who most urge negotiations care little about making him fulfil them; to employ his name and authority to destroy the army is their only aim; the army has achieved power; it must make use of it to prevent its own ruin and that of the nation." Fairfax admitted this, protested that, in case of need, he would be ready to employ the force he had at his disposal for the safety of the public cause: "But," said he, "I must be clearly and positively called upon to do so; and for the present, I must prosecute this wearisome siege, which has already lasted so long, despite all our efforts." Ludlow went to Ireton, whom Cromwell had taken care to leave with the general, and from whom he expected more zeal. "The moment is not yet come," said Ireton; "we must let the negotiations go on, and the peril become evident." The republicans, in default of the army, got up threatening petitions to parliament, one, among the rest, drawn up by Henry Martyn (Sept. 11),² which, setting forth all the principles of the party, summoned the commons to declare themselves the sovereign power, and at length to answer the expectations of the people by giving them the reforms they had anticipated when they took up arms for the parliament. The commons made no reply; two days after, a second petition came, complaining bitterly of such contempt; and this time the petitioners waited in a body at the door, angrily crying: "We know no use of a king or lords any longer! these distinctions were the devices of men; God made us all equal; there are many thousands will spend their blood in maintenance of these principles; forty thousand of us have signed this petition, but we hold five thousand horse would do more good in it." Even some of the members, Scott, Blackiston, and Weaver, went out, mingled familiarly with the crowd, and encouraged them. The house persisted in its silence; but the firmer it showed itself, the

¹ Ludlow, 113.

² Parl. Hist. iii. 1003—1012; Rushworth, ii. 4, 1257.

more violently did the party hurry on towards its most extreme designs, and five days after this scene (Sept 18),¹ Henry Martyn suddenly departed for Scotland, which Cromwell had just entered.

At the same time (Sept. 13), fifteen commissioners proceeded to the Isle of Wight, five lords and ten members of the commons,² all, excepting Vane, and perhaps lord Say, favourable to peace. Never had negotiation excited such anxious expectation; it was to last forty days; the king had eagerly accepted it, giving his word that during that period and for twenty days after, he would make no attempt to escape. Twenty of his oldest servants, lords, divines, lawyers, had been permitted to advise with him; he had even requested and obtained that part of his household, domestics, pages, secretaries, chamberlains, grooms of the chamber and so on, should be restored to him on this occasion.³ Accordingly, when the commissioners arrived in the little town of Newport (Sept. 15), the throng was so great that three days passed before all the new-comers could procure lodgings. Meantime, the commissioners waited upon the king every morning, profoundly respectful but very reserved, and no one of them venturing to converse with him in private. But on the other hand, most of them held familiar communication with his councillors, and through them conveyed to him their advice, exhorting him above all things to accept at once and without discussion the proposals of parliament; for, said they, all would be lost if the negotiation was not concluded and the king returned to London before the army and Cromwell should arrive there.⁴ Charles seemed to believe in the sincerity of their counsels and inclined to adopt them; but in his heart he nourished a far different hope: Ormond, who for the last six months had found refuge in Paris, was about to reappear in Ireland, provided with the money and ammunition which the court of France had promised him; he was upon his arrival, and in concert with lord Inchiquin, to con-

¹ Whitelocks, 337.

² The lords Northumberland, Pembroke, Salisbury, Middlesex, and Say, Wenman; Messieurs Holles, Pierpoint, Vane, Grimstone, sir John Potts, John Carew, Samuel Brown, John Glynn, and John Bulkley.

³ Parl. Hist. iii. 1001; Journals, Lords, Aug. 24.

⁴ Clarendon, iii. 310, &c; Herbert, Memoirs 73.

clude a peace with the catholics, and enter upon a vigorous war against the parliament; so that the king, who was then to make his escape, might have a kingdom and soldiers.¹ "This new negotiation," he wrote (August) to sir William Hopkins,² who was charged to arrange his flight, "will be derisive, like the rest; there is no change in my designs." The conference was officially opened on the 18th of September; the king sat under a canopy at the upper end of the hall a little before him were the commissioners from Westminster seated round a table; behind his chair stood his own councillors, perfectly silent; for it was with the king in person that the parliament desired to treat; any mediator would have seemed to lower its dignity; and in their punctual submission, the commissioners were scarcely prevailed upon to permit the presence of any witnesses whatever. Charles, accordingly, maintained the discussion alone; only, when he thought fit, he might retire into an adjoining room, to take the advice of his councillors.³ At the sight of their king thus solitary, thus thrown upon his own resources, an inward emotion thrilled the hearts of all present. Charles's hair had turned grey; an expression of habitual sadness had blended with the haughtiness of his glance; his deportment, his voice, his every feature revealed a proud but yet subdued soul, alike incapable of struggling against its destiny, or of yielding to it; a touching and singular mixture of grandeur without power, of presumption without hope. The proposals of parliament, still the same, except a few unimportant modifications, were successively read and examined. Charles entered with a good grace into the discussion, calm, ready to answer any questions, taking no offence at objections, and skilfully making the most of the good points of his case; astonishing, in short, his most prejudiced adversaries by the firmness of his mind, his gentleness, and his knowledge of the affairs and laws of the kingdom. "The king," said the earl of Salisbury one day to sir Philip Warwick, "has made marvellous progress." "No, my lord," replied Warwick, "the king was always what he is now, but your lordship perceives it too

¹ Carte, *Life of Ormond*, ii. 20—38.

² The king's letters to sir William Hopkins were published in the third edition of Wagstaff's work, "*Vindication of the Royal Martyr*."

³ Herbert, 72; Warwick, 323; Clarendon, *ut sup.*

late." Buckley, one of the commissioners from the commons, urged him to accept the whole, assuring him that "the treaty once ended, the devil himself would not be able to break it." "Sir," said Charles, "if you call this a treaty, consider whether it be not like the fray in the comedy where the man comes out and says, 'There has been a fray and no fray;' and being asked how that could be, 'why,' says he, 'there hath been three blows given, and I had them all.' Look whether this be not a parallel case: I have granted, absolutely, most of your propositions, and with great moderation limited only some few of them; and you make me no concessions."¹ He had, indeed, consented to the demands of parliament, as to the command of the sea and land forces; the nomination to the great offices of state, as to Ireland, even as to the legitimacy of the resistance which had brought on the civil war; but instead of giving up at once and without hesitation, he disputed every foot of the ground he could no longer defend; sometimes himself addressing different proposals to the house, sometimes seeking to elude his own concessions, pertinacious in asserting his right at the very moment he was giving it up, inexhaustible in subtleties and reticences, daily giving his adversaries some new reason to think that the hardest necessity was their only security against him. Moreover, he persisted, as much from conscientious motives as with a view to the interest of his prerogative, in opposing the abolition of episcopacy and the severities which they desired to inflict on his principal supporters. Finally, after having solemnly promised that all hostilities in Ireland should cease,² he secretly wrote to Ormond (Oct. 10):³ "Obey my wife's orders, not mine, until I shall let you know I am free from all restraint; nor trouble yourself about my concessions as to Ireland: they will not lead to anything;" and the day on which he had consented to transfer to parliament for twenty years the command of the army (Oct. 9),⁴ he wrote to sir William Hopkins: "To tell you the truth, my great concession this morning was made only with a view to facilitate my approaching escape; without that hope, I should never have yielded in this manner. If I had refused, I could, without

¹ Warwick, 323.

² Journals, Lords, Dec. 1.

³ Carte, Life of Ormond, ii. Appendix, No. 31, 32, p. 17.

⁴ Parl. Hist. iii. 1048

much sorrow, have returned to my prison; but as it is, I own it would break my heart, for I have done that which my escape alone can justify."¹

The parliament, though without any exact information, suspected all this perfidy; even the friends of peace, the men most affected by the king's condition, and most earnest to save him, replied but hesitatingly to the charges of the independents. At the same time, the presbyterian devotees, though moderate in their political views, were invincible in their hatred of episcopacy, and would admit of no compromise. no delay, in reference to the triumph of the covenant. This idea, moreover, had fixed itself in men's minds, that after so many evils brought upon the country by war, it was necessary that the conquered party should legally undergo its responsibility, and that to satisfy divine justice, manifested in the Holy Scriptures by so striking examples, the crime of the real culprits should be expiated by their punishment. The number of these was discussed: the popular fanatics demanded a multitude of exceptions to the amnesty which was to be proclaimed upon the restoration of peace; the presbyterians only demanded seven;² but this with insurmountable determination, for they would have thought they accepted their own condemnation in giving up one of them. Narrow prejudices and feelings of hatred thus impeded even among the peace-party the success of the negotiations. Five times (Oct. 2, 11, and 27; Nov. 2, and 24), during their continuation, the king's offers or concessions were voted insufficient. Meantime, the period appointed for the duration of the conferences expired; their term was thrice extended (Nov. 2, 18, and 24); it was decided (Oct. 20) that Sundays and holidays should not be reckoned,³ but all this without any further concession, without giving the negotiators any fresh instructions or the slightest discretion. The king, on his part, declared, upon his honour and faith, that he would go no further: "I will be like that captain," he said, "that had defended a place well, and his superiors not being able to relieve him, he had leave to surrender it; but," he replied,

¹ Wagstaff, *Vindication of the Royal Martyr*, &c., Appendix, 161.

² Lords Newcastle and Digby, sir Marmaduke Langdale, sir Richard Greenville, David Jenkins, sir Francis Doddington, and sir John Byron.

³ Parl. Hist. iii. 1038.

"though they cannot relieve me in the time I demand it, let them relieve me when they can; else I will hold it out till I make some stone in it my tombstone. And so will I do by the church of England;"¹ and the negotiation remained motionless and futile, serving no purpose but to display the impotent anxiety of the two parties, both obstinately blinding themselves to the necessity of the case.²

Yet around them all things were hastening onwards, and daily assuming a more threatening aspect. After two months of the most desperate resistance, Colchester, conquered by famine and sedition, at last surrendered (Aug. 27);³ and the next day a court-martial condemned to death three of its bravest defenders, sir Charles Lucas, sir George Lisle, and sir Bernard Gascoign, as an example, it was said, to future rebels who might be tempted to imitate them. In vain did the other prisoners, lord Capel at their head, entreat Fairfax to suspend the execution of the sentence, or at least that they should all undergo it, since all were alike guilty of the offence of these three. Fairfax, excited by the long struggle, or rather intimidated by Ireton, made no answer, and the condemned officers were ordered to be shot on the spot. Sir Charles Lucas was the first executed; as he fell, Lisle ran and kissed him, and immediately standing up: "Soldiers," he exclaimed, "come nearer; you are too far off." "Rest assured," they replied, "we'll hit you." "Comrades," answered Lisle, smiling, "I have been nearer, and you missed me;" and he fell by the side of his friend. Gascoign was taking off his coat, when a reprieve arrived for him from the general.⁴ Colchester being taken; there was no longer, in the eastern counties, any rallying point for insurrection. In the north, Cromwell, having conquered Hamilton, entered Scotland without obstacle (Sept. 20); the peasants of the western counties rose in a body at the first rumour of his victory; and each parish, led by its minister, marched towards Edinburgh to drive the royalists thence;⁵ six miles from Berwick,

¹ Warwick, 327.

² Clarendon, State Papers, ii. 222—261; Parl. Hist. iii. 1002—1129; Warwick, *ut sup.*

³ Rushworth, ii. 4, 1241—1249.

⁴ Clarendon, iii. 268.

⁵ This expedition was called in Scotland the insurrection of the 'whig-amores,' from the word 'whigam,' used by the peasants in driving their

at lord Mordington's seat, Argyle, who had come to meet him, had (Sept. 22)¹ a long conference with him; both as clear-sighted as daring, success did not blind them to the danger before them; the Scottish royalists, powerful notwithstanding their defeat, and still in arms in many places, manifested a determination not to subject themselves unresistingly to a bloody reaction; a treaty forthwith concluded (Sept. 26)² secured to them full tranquillity and the enjoyment of their property, on condition of disbanding their troops, abjuring any engagement in favour of the king, and renewing the oath "to the holy league which ought never to have ceased to exist between the two kingdoms." Thus re-established in the possession of government, Argyle and his party received Cromwell at Edinburgh with great pomp; the committee of the states, the municipal body, which had been thoroughly purged, the fanatic ministers and people; overwhelmed him with daily visits, speeches, sermons, and banquets; but urged by the reports from Henry Martyn, and leaving with them Lambert and two regiments to maintain their power, he retraced with all speed the road to England (Oct. 11).³ He had scarcely entered Yorkshire, where he seemed solely engaged in completing the suppression of the insurrection, than numerous petitions were sent from that county, addressed to the commons only, demanding prompt justice upon the delinquents, whatever their rank or name. At the same time, the same demand was expressed by other counties, and always presented or supported by the friends of Cromwell (Oct. 10 and Nov. 6). The presbyterians opposed it in the name of the great charter, and of the laws of the kingdom: "We have had, Mr. Speaker," said Denis Bond, an obscure republican, "many doctrines preached here by several gentlemen, against the power of this house; such as that we cannot try my lord of Norwich but by his peers, because it is against Magna Charta; but I trust ere long to see the day when we may have power to hang the greatest lord of them all, if he deserves it, without trial by his peers; and I doubt not we

horses. Thence the name of Whigs, afterwards given to the party opposed to court, as the representative and successor of the most zealous Scottish covenanters. Burnet, i. 74.

¹ Rushworth, ii. 4, 1282.

² Burnet, *Memoirs of the Hamiltons*, 367, 368; Laing, iii. 405.

³ Rushworth, ii. 4, 1295, 1296.

shall have honest, resolute judges to do it, notwithstanding Magna Charta."¹ The house rejected these petitions, but others immediately followed, far more explicit and formidable, for they came from the regiments of Ireton, Ingoldsby, Fleetwood, Whalley, and Overton, and explicitly demanded, of the commons that justice should be done upon the king, of Fairfax the re-establishment of the general council of the army, "the only remedy," they said, "against the disasters which threaten us, either by its representations to the house or by other means (Oct. 18 and 30)."² The council accordingly resumed its sittings, and, on the 20th of November, the speaker informed the house that certain officers were at the door, with colonel Ewers at their head, who were come in the name of the general and of the army to present a paper to them; it was a long remonstrance, similar to that which, seven years before (Nov. 21, 1641),³ on the same day, and in order effectually to break off with him, the commons had themselves addressed to the king. Adopting their example, the army enumerated in their petitions all the evils, all the fears of England, imputing them to the want of energy in the parliament, to its neglect of public interests, to its negotiations with the king; it called upon it to bring him solemnly to trial, to proclaim the sovereignty of the people, to decree that henceforward the king should be elected by its representatives, to put an end to the present session, but to provide before separating for the equal distribution of the suffrage, for the regular meeting of future parliaments, for all the reforms desired by the well-affected, and threatening, finally, though in guarded expressions, that the army itself would proceed to save the country, if it remained any longer compromised by the negligence or weakness of men who, after all, were only, like the soldiers, the delegates and servants of their fellow-citizens.⁴

On hearing this read, a complete storm arose in the house; the independents, Scott, Holland, and Wentworth, loudly demanded that the army should forthwith receive the thanks of the house for these frank and courageous counsels; the presbyterians, some with indignation, others in terms flatter-

¹ Parl. Hist., iii. 1042; Rushworth, ii. 4, 1318; Whitelocke, 346.

² Parl. Hist., iii. 1056, 1077; Rushworth, ii. 4, 1207, 1311; Whitelocke, 343, 1641.

³ See p. 110 of this work.

⁴ Parl. Hist., iii. 1077—1128; Whitelocke, 355.

ing to the officers, urged the house to lay aside the remonstrance, and, by way of marking their displeasure, return no answer to it.¹ This expedient suited the timid as well as the bold; it was adopted after two days' debate (Nov. 20 and 29), by a great majority (125 to 53). But the day had come when victories served only to hasten the final defeat: out of doors, as well as within, excitement and confusion were at their height; already there was talk of Cromwell's approaching return;² already the army announced the design of marching upon London.³ The royalists, losing all hope, now only thought of getting rid of, or avenging themselves on, their enemies, no matter by what means: several republican members were insulted and attacked in the streets;⁴ hints reached Fairfax, even from France, that two cavaliers had resolved to assassinate him at St. Albans;⁵ at Doncaster, a party of twenty men carried off Rainsborough, who commanded there, and three of them poniarded him at the moment he was endeavouring to escape from them (Oct. 29);⁶ there was even a report that a plot was forming to murder eighty of the most influential members as they left the house.⁷ At last, amidst this anarchical fury, the news came, one upon the other, that in two days (Dec. 2) Cromwell would be at head-quarters; that, in the Isle of Wight, the governor, Hammond, suspected of too great consideration for the king and the parliament, had received orders from Fairfax (Nov. 25) to resign his post, to return to the army, and transfer the charge of the king to colonel Ewers;⁸ that on hearing this, Charles, seized with fear, had extended his concessions, closed the conferences at Newport, and that, on the same day (Nov. 28), the commissioners had set off with his definitive offers to parliament.

They arrived the next day, most of them deeply affected by the peril in which they had left the king, and by his last farewell: "My lords," he said to them, "you come to take leave of me, and I can scarcely believe we shall ever meet again; but the will of God be done! I give him thanks, I have made my peace with him, and I shall without fear suffer all it

¹ *Mercurius Pragmaticus*, No. 35.

² Rushworth, ii. 4, 1320.

³ Whitelocke, 358; *Parl. Hist.* iii. 1137—1141.

⁴ Rushworth, ii. 4, i, 270.

⁵ *Ib.* 1280.

⁶ Clarendon, iii. 287; Whitelocke, 341; Rushworth, ii. 4, 1315.

⁷ Rushworth, ii. 4, 1279.

⁸ *Parl. Hist.* iii. 1133—1137.

shall please men to do unto me. My lords, you cannot be ignorant that in my ruin you may already perceive your own, and that near at hand. I pray God that he may send you better friends than I have found. I am not ignorant of the plot contrived against me and mine; but nothing afflicts me so much as the spectacle of the sufferings of my people and the presentiment of the evils prepared for them by men who, always talking of the public good, only seek to gratify their own ambition."¹ As soon as the commissioners had made their report (Dec. 1), though the king's new concessions differed but little from those they had so many times rejected, the presbyterians proposed to the commons to declare them satisfactory and fit to serve as the basis of peace. The motion was even supported by Nathaniel Fiennes, son of lord Say, and lately one of the most violent of the independent leaders. The debate had already lasted several hours, when information was received of a letter from Fairfax to the common council, in which he announced that the army was marching upon London: "Question! question!" immediately shouted the independents, eager to make the most of this alarm. But, contrary to their expectations, and notwithstanding all their efforts, the debate was adjourned till the next day.² It was then resumed more fiercely than ever, amid the movement of the troops who were pouring in on all sides, and taking up their quarters at St. James's, at York House, throughout Westminster and the city. The independents still looked to fear to give them the victory: "By this debate," said Vane, "we shall soon guess who are our friends and who our enemies; or, to speak more plainly, we shall understand by the carriage of this business, who are the king's party in the house, and who for the people." "Mr. Speaker," quickly followed another member whose name is not known, "since this gentleman has had the presumption to divide this house into two parts, I hope it is as lawful for me to take the same liberty, and likewise to divide the house into two parts upon this debate. Mr. Speaker, you will find some that are desirous of a peace and settlement, and those are such as have lost by the war; others you will find that

¹ The Works of King Charles the Martyr, London, 1602, 434.

² Parl. Hist. iii. 1143—1145.

are against peace, and these are such as have gained by the war. My humble motion, therefore, is this, that the gainers may contribute to the losers, that we may all be brought to an equal degree; for till then the balance of the commonwealth will never stand right toward a settlement." The independents opposed this, but with some embarrassment, for in both parties personal interest exercised a power which they themselves scarcely ventured to deny. Rudyard, Stephens, Grimstone, Walker, Prideaux, Wroth, Scott, Corbet, and many others successively supported and opposed the motion without the debate appearing to draw to a conclusion. Day declined; several members had already retired; one of the independents proposed to call for lights: "Mr. Speaker," said a presbyterian, "I perceive very well that the drift of some gentlemen is to take advantage not only of the terror now brought on us by the present approach of the army, but also to spin out the debate of this business to an unseasonable time of night, by which means the more ancient members of the house (whom they look upon as most inclined to peace) will be tired out and forced to depart before we can come to a resolution; and therefore I hope the house will not agree to this last proposal;" and, notwithstanding the clamours of the independents, the debate was again adjourned.¹

Two days after,² when they met, a dark rumour agitated the house; the king, it was said on all sides, had been carried away from the Isle of Wight in the night, despite his resistance, and taken to Hurst Castle, a sort of prison, standing on the coast opposite the island, at the extremity of a barren, deserted, and unhealthy promontory. Vehemently called upon for an explanation, the independent leaders remained silent; but the speaker read letters from Newport, addressed to the house by major Ralph, who commanded in the absence of Hammond. The rumour was well founded, and all communication between the king and the parliament henceforward impossible, except with the consent of the army.³

On the 29th of November, towards evening, a few hours after the conference at Newport was over, and the commis-

¹ Parl. Hist. iii. 1145—1147; Ludlow, 117.

² December 4th; the debate had been adjourned till that day, because the 3rd was a Sunday.

³ Parl. Hist. iii. 1147, 1148

sioners departed, a man in disguise said to one of the king's people. "Troops have just landed in the island; tell the king he will be carried away to-night." Charles immediately sent for the duke of Richmond, the earl of Lindsey, and colonel Edward Cook, an officer who possessed his confidence, and asked how they could ascertain whether the report was true. It was useless to question major Ralph: nothing but short, vague answers were to be got from him: "The king may sleep quietly to-night; upon my life, no one will disturb him to-night." Cook offered to mount his horse, ride round the coast, and in particular go to Carisbrook, where it was said the troops had arrived, personally to ascertain what was going on. The night was dark, it rained heavily, the service was a dangerous one; the king hesitated to accept it, but Cook insisted, and went off. He found the garrison of Carisbrook reinforced; there were ten or twelve fresh officers, by whom captain Bowerman, who commanded there, was almost openly watched; there was altogether an air of mysterious agitation. He returned in all haste to bring the king this information, when, on reaching Newport, towards midnight, he found the house the king occupied surrounded with guards; there were some under every window, even inside the house, at the very door of the king's chamber, into which the smoke of their pipes penetrated. There was now no room for doubt; the two lords conjured the king to attempt an escape that very hour, at all risks. This counsel was not agreeable to the timid sedateness of Charles; he alleged the difficulty, the irritation it would cause in the army: "If they do take me," said he, "they must preserve me for their own sakes, for neither party can secure its own interests without joining mine with them." "Take heed, sir," said Lindsey, "least your majesty fall into such hands as will not steer by such rules of policy. Remember Hampton Court." "Colonel," said Richmond to Cook, "how did you pass?" Cook: "I have the word." Richmond: "Could you enable me to pass, too?" Cook: "I have no doubt of it." Richmond put on a trooper's cloak; they went out, passed through all the stations, and returned without any interruption. Standing with the king near a window, the two lords passionately renewed their entreaties; the colonel, drenched with rain, stood alone before the fire: "Ned Cook," said the king, suddenly turning to-

wards him, "what do you advise in this case?" Cook hesitated to answer: "Your majesty," he said, "has here your privy councillors." "Ned, I command you to give me your advice." Cook: "Well, then, will your majesty allow me to address you a question?" The king: "Speak." Cook: "Suppose I should not only tell your majesty, but prove to you that the army intend forthwith to seize your person; if I add, that I have the word, horses ready at hand, a vessel attending me, hourly expecting me, that I am ready and desirous to attend you, that this dark night seems made on purpose, that I see no difficulty in the thing, what would your majesty do?" Charles remained silent for a moment; then, shaking his head, he said: "No, they promised me and I promised them; I will not break first." Cook: "But, sir, I presume that by 'they' and 'them' your majesty means the parliament; if so, the scene is changed; it is the army who want to throw your majesty into prison." The king: "No matter; I will not break my word: good night, Ned; good night, Lindsey; I am going to rest as long as I can." Cook: "I fear it will not be long." The king: "As it please God." It was one o'clock; they withdrew, and Charles went to bed, Richmond alone remaining with him.

At break of day there was a knocking at the door; "Who are you? what do you want?" asked Richmond. "Officers of the army, who want to speak with the king." Richmond did not open the door, waiting for the king to be dressed; the knocks were repeated, and with violence: "Open the door," said Charles to the duke; and before he was out of bed, several officers, with lieutenant-colonel Cobbett at their head, rushed into the room. "Sir," said Cobbett, "we have orders to remove you." The king: "Orders, from whom?" Cobbett: "From the army." The king: "Whither am I to be removed?" Cobbett: "To the castle." The king: "What castle?" Cobbett: "To the castle." The king: "The castle is no castle; I am ready to follow you to any castle, but name it." Cobbett consulted his companions, and at last answered, "To Hurst castle." The king turned towards Richmond, and said; "They could not name a worse;" and then addressing Cobbett, he said: "Can I have none of my servants with me?" Cobbett: "Only those absolutely indispensable." Charles named his two valets-de-chambre, Harrington and Herbert,

and Mildmay his esquire-carver. Richmond went out to order breakfast, but before it was ready the horses were brought up. "Sir," said Cobbett, "we must go." The king got into the carriage without uttering a word, Harrington, Herbert, and Mildmay with him; Cobbett came forward to get in, but Charles barred the way with his foot, and had the door immediately closed. They drove off under the escort of a detachment of cavalry; a little vessel was waiting at Yarmouth; the king embarked in it, and, three hours after, was shut up in Hurst castle, having no communication from without, in a room so dark that at mid-day flambeaux were necessary, and under the guard of colonel Ewer, a far rougher and more dangerous jailer than Cobbett had been.¹

At this intelligence the presbyterians gave free course to their indignation: "The house," they cried, "guaranteed the king, during his stay at Newport, respect, security, and liberty; they are dishonoured, undone, if they do not give marked resistance to this insolent rebellion." They voted accordingly that the king had been taken away without the knowledge or consent of the house; and the debate relative to peace was resumed with redoubled earnestness. It had already lasted more than twelve hours; the night was far advanced; though the assembly was still numerous, fatigue began to surmount the zeal of the more feeble and aged; a man rose, famous among the martyrs of public liberty, but who had only sat in the house three weeks—the same Prynne, who, twelve years before, had sustained so hard a struggle against the tyranny of Laud and of the court: "Mr Speaker," said he, "first, I would remove two seeming prejudices, which else may enervate the strength of what I am about to say: some members, firstly, have aspersed me, that I am a Royal Favourite, alluding to the title of one of my works. All the royal favour I ever yet received from his majesty or his party, was the cutting off of my ears, at two several times, one after another, in a most barbarous manner; the setting me upon three several pillories, in a disgraceful manner, for two hours at a time; the burning of my licensed books before my face by the hand of the hangman; the imposing of two fines upon me of 5000*l.* a-piece; expulsion from the house, and court, and university

¹ Colonel Cook's narrative in Rushworth, ii. 4, 1344—1348; Herbert, 83; Parl. Hist. 1149—1151; Clarendon, iii. 359.

of Oxford; the loss of my culling almost nine years' space; above eight years imprisonment, without pens, ink, paper, or books, except my Bible, and without access of friends, or any allowance of diet for my support. If any member envy me for such royal favours, I only wish him the same badges of favour, and then he will no more causelessly asperse me for a Royal Favourite, or apostate from the public cause." He spoke for several hours after this, minutely discussing all the king's proposals, all the pretensions of the army; considering in turn in their different aspects, the state of parliament and of the country, grave without pedantry, earnest without anger, evidently elevated by the energy and disinterestedness of his conscience above the passions of his sect, the faults of his own character, and the usual extent of his own talent. "Mr. Speaker," he said, before he concluded, "they further object that, if we discontent the army, we are undone; they will all lay down their arms, as one commander of eminence hath here openly told you he must do, and serve us no longer; and then, what will become of us and all our faithful friends? If the army do so, I shall not much value the protection of such inconstant, mutinous, and unreasonable servants; and I doubt not, if they forsake us on so slight a ground, God himself and the whole kingdom will stand by us; and if the king and we shall happily conclude this treaty, I hope we shall have no great need of their future service. However, *fiat justitia, ruat cælum*; let us do our duty, and leave the issue to God." The house had listened to this speech with attention, with profound emotion; it was nine o'clock in the morning; the house had sat twenty-four hours; there were still present two hundred and forty-four members; they at length went to a division; and it was resolved by one hundred and forty against one hundred and four, that the king's reply was an adequate basis of peace.

Power was escaping from the independents; they had exhausted even fear; all those members who could be influenced by it had given way or retired. In vain did Ludlow, Hutchinson, and a few others, in order to throw the house into confusion, demand leave to enter a protest against the decision; their wish was rejected, as contrary to the

usages of the house, and no notice taken of it in the way they desired.¹ After the rising of the house, the independent leaders assembled; a great number of officers, arrived that morning from head-quarters, joined them: the peril was imminent; but, masters of the army, they had that at command with which to resist it; sincere fanatics or ambitious free-thinkers, no institution, no law, no custom, had any longer importance in their eyes; with the former, it was held to be a duty to save the good cause; the others were impelled by necessity. It was agreed that the day was come for action, and six of those present, three members of the house and three officers, were charged to take immediate steps to ensure success. They passed several hours together, a list of the commons before them on the table, examining one by one the conduct and principles of each member, exchanging information, and sending orders to their confidants. Next day, the 6th of December, at seven in the morning, under the direction of Ireton, and before Fairfax knew anything of the matter, troops were in motion. With Skippon's consent, the parties of militia, who guarded parliament, had been withdrawn; two regiments, that of colonel Pride, infantry, and that of colonel Rich, cavalry, occupied Palace Yard, Westminster hall, the stairs, vestibule, and every access to the house; at the door of the commons stood Pride, with the list of proscribed members in his hand, and near him lord Grey of Groby and an usher, who pointed them out to him as they arrived: "You must not go in," said Pride to each; and he had had some of the most suspected seized and taken away. A violent tumult soon arose all round the house; the excluded members tried every access, asserted their rights, and called upon the soldiers to vindicate them; the soldiers laughed and jeered. Some, Prynne amongst others, resisted strenuously; "I will not stir of my own accord," said he; and some officers pushed him insultingly down the stairs, delighted to make use of their party's power for the purposes of individual tyranny. Forty-one members were arrested in this manner, and shut up for the time in two adjoining rooms; many others were excluded without being arrested. Two only, of those comprised in Pride's list, Stephens and colonel

¹ Ludlow, 117; Hutchinson, 301.

Birch, had succeeded in getting into the house; they were drawn to the door under some pretext and immediately seized by the soldiers. "Mr. Speaker," cried Birch, endeavouring to force his way back into the house, "will the house suffer their members to be pulled out thus violently before their faces, and yet sit still?" The house sent their sergeant-at-arms to order the members who were outside to come and take their seats; Pride would not allow them to go; the sergeant was sent a second time, but could not get to them. The house resolved that they would not proceed to business until their members were admitted, and appointed a committee to go to the general and demand their release. The committee had scarcely gone, when a message arrived from the army, presented by lieutenant-colonel Axtell, and some officers; they demanded the official exclusion of the arrested members, and of all those who had voted for peace. The house returned no answer, waiting the result of the proceedings of their committee. The committee brought back word that the general in his turn refused to reply, until the house had come to some decision on the message of the army. Meantime, the excluded members had been taken away from Westminster, and led from one quarter of London to another, from tavern to tavern, sometimes crowded into coaches, sometimes hurried along on foot through the mud, surrounded by soldiers demanding their arrears. The preacher Hugh Peters, chaplain to Fairfax, came solemnly, sword on thigh, by the general's orders, to take down their names; called upon by several of them to say by what right they were arrested.—"By the right of the sword," said he. They sent to entreat Pride to hear them; "I have no time," was the answer; "I've something else to do." Fairfax and his council, who were sitting at Whitehall, at last promised them an audience; they went thither; but after waiting several hours, three officers came out and announced that the general was so busy, he could not receive them. Some embarrassment was visible under this contempt; it was clear that the dominant party wished to avoid an interview with these men, lest their invincible pertinacity should necessitate too much rigour. Notwithstanding the audacity of their designs and of their acts, the conquerors still retained in the bottom of their hearts, without suspecting it themselves, a

secret respect for ancient and legal order; in drawing up their proscription list, they had confined themselves within the limits of what they deemed the necessity of the case, hoping that a qualified purification of parliament would suffice to secure their triumph. They saw with anxiety the house obstinately claiming their members, and their adversaries still retaining a powerful party, perhaps even the majority. But hesitation was impossible: they resolved to begin again. Next day (the 7th) the troops once more closed up every avenue to the house, the same scene was renewed; forty more members were excluded; several others were arrested in their own houses. They wrote to the house to be released; but this time the defeat of the presbyterians was completed; instead of answering them favourably, the house adopted, by fifty votes to twenty-eight, a motion for taking the proposals of the army into consideration. This minority retired of their own accord, protesting that they would not return to the house until justice should be done to their colleagues; and after the expulsion of one hundred and forty-three members, who for the most part, were not arrested or silently quitted their confinement after a few hours, the republicans and the army at length found themselves, at Westminster, as well as elsewhere, in full possession of power.¹

Thenceforward everything gave way before them; there was no resistance; not a single opposing voice disturbed the party in the intoxication of their victory; they alone spoke, they alone acted in the kingdom, and might anticipate the universal submission or consent of the country. The enthusiasm of the fanatics was at its height—"Like Moses," said Hugh Peters to the generals, in a sermon before the remnants of the two houses—"like Moses, you are destined to take the people out of the bondage of Egypt: how will this be accomplished? that is what has not yet been revealed?" He put his hands before his eyes, laid his head on the cushion, and, rising thence suddenly, exclaimed. "Now I have it, by revelation! Now I shall tell you! This army must root up monarchy, not only here, but in France, and other kingdoms round about; this is to bring you out of Egypt. This army

¹ Parl. Hist. ii. 1240—1249; Rushworth, ii. 4, 1353—1356; Ludlow, 118; Hutchinson, 301; Walker, Hist. of Independency, ii. 29, &c.

is that corner-stone, cut out of the mountain, which must dash the powers of the earth to pieces. 'Tis objected, the way we walk in is without precedent: what think you of the Virgin Mary? was there ever any precedent before that a woman should conceive without holding the company of man? This is an age to make examples and precedents in;"¹ and the mob of the party gave way with transport to this mystical pride. Amidst all this exultation, on the very day when the last of the presbyterians retired from the commons (Dec. 7), Cromwell came and resumed his seat: "God is my witness," he repeated everywhere, "that I know nothing of what has been doing in this house, but the work is in hand, I am glad of it, and now we must carry it through."² The house received him with the most marked demonstrations of gratitude. The speaker addressed to him official thanks for his campaign in Scotland; and on leaving the house, he took up his lodgings at Whitehall, in the king's own apartments.³ Next day, the army took possession of the cash-chests of the various committees, being forced, they said, to provide for their own wants, in order no longer to be a burden to the country.⁴ Three days after (Dec. 11) they sent to Fairfax, under the title of "A new Agreement of the People," a plan of a republican government, drawn up, it is said, by Ireton, and requested him to submit it for discussion to the general council of officers, who would afterwards present it to parliament.⁵ Meantime, and without taking the trouble of asking the consent of the lords, the commons repealed all the acts, all the votes lately adopted in favour of peace and which would have placed obstacles in the way of the revolution (Dec. 12 and 13).⁶ At last, petitions reappeared that the king, who alone, they said, was guilty of so much bloodshed,⁷ should be brought to trial; and a detachment was sent from head-quarters, with orders to bring him from Hurst castle to Windsor.

On the 17th, in the middle of the night, Charles was awakened by the noise of the drawbridge being lowered, and of a troop of horse entering the castle yard. In a few moments all was again silent; but Charles was anxious; before day-

¹ Walker, ii. 50; Parl. Hist. iii. 1252.

² Ludlow, 117.

³ Parl. Hist. iii. 1246; Whitelocke, 357.

⁴ Rushworth, ii. 4, 1856.

⁵ Rushworth, ii. 4, 1858, 1803.

⁶ Parl. Hist. iii. 1247—1249.

⁷ Rushworth, ii. 4, 1372.

break, he rang for Herbert, who slept in the adjoining room: "Did you hear the noise about midnight?" he inquired. "I heard the drawbridge lowered," said Herbert; "but I dared not, without your majesty's orders, go out of my room at so unseasonable an hour." "Go and inquire what is the matter." Herbert went, and soon returning, said major Harrison had arrived. A sudden agitation appeared on the king's countenance; "Are you sure," he said, "it is major Harrison?" Herbert: "Captain Reynolds told me so." The king: "Then I believe it; but did you see the major?" Herbert: "No, sir." The king: "Did Reynolds tell you what the major's business is?" Herbert: "I did all I could to learn, but the only answer I could get was, that the occasion of his coming would soon be known." The king sent Herbert away, and then recalled him in about an hour after. He found the king so deeply agitated, that he wept. "Why weep you?" asked Charles. "Because I perceive your majesty so much troubled and concerned at this news." "I am not afraid," said Charles; "but do not you know that this is the man who intended to assassinate me, as by letter I was informed, during the late treaty. To my knowledge I never saw the major, or did him an injury. I would not be taken by surprise; this is a place fit for such a purpose. Herbert, I trust to your care; go again and make further inquiry into his business." Herbert, this time more fortunate, learnt that the major was come to take the king to Windsor, in three days at latest; and he hastened to inform Charles of it. "Well and good," he answered, his eyes brightening with joy; "what do they at last become less obdurate? Windsor is a place I ever delighted in; it will make amends for what I have suffered here."

Two days after, in fact, lieutenant-colonel Cobbett came to tell the king that he had orders to take him immediately to Windsor, whither Harrison had already returned. Charles, far from objecting, hastened the departure himself. Three miles from Hurst he found a body of horse, charged to escort him to Winchester. Everywhere on his road a crowd of gentlemen, citizens, peasants, came round him; some of them, mere sight-seekers, who retired after they had seen him pass, without any particular observation; others deeply interested and praying aloud for his liberty. As he approached Winchester,

the mayor and aldermen came to meet him, and presenting him, according to custom, the mace and keys of the city, addressed to him a speech full of affection. But Cobbett, rudely pushing his way towards them, asked if they had forgotten that the house had declared all who should address the king traitors; whereupon, seized with terror, the functionaries poured forth humble excuses, protesting they were ignorant of the will of the house, and conjuring Cobbett to obtain their pardon. The next day the king resumed his journey. Between Alresford and Farnham another corps of cavalry was drawn up, waiting to relieve the party which had escorted him thus far; the officer in command was good-looking, richly equipped, wearing a velvet Montero cap, a new buff coat, and a fringed scarf of crimson silk. Charles, struck with his countenance, passed slowly by him, and received a respectful military salute. Rejoining Herbert: "Who," asked the king, "is that officer?" "Major Harrison, sir." The king immediately turned round, and looked at him so long and so attentively that the major, confused, retired behind the troops to avoid his scrutiny. "That man," said Charles, "looks like a true soldier; I have some judgment on faces, and feel I have harboured wrong thoughts of him." In the evening, at Farnham, where they stopped to sleep, Charles saw the major in a corner of the room; he beckoned him to approach; Harrison obeyed with deference and embarrassment, with an air at once fearless and timid: the king took him by the arm, led him into the embrasure of a window, and conversed for nearly an hour with him, and even spoke of the information he had received concerning him: "Nothing can be more false," said Harrison; "this is what I said, and I can repeat it: it is, 'that the law was equally obligatory to great and small, and that justice had no respect to persons;'" and he dwelt upon the last words with marked emphasis. The king broke off the discourse, sat down to table, and did not again address Harrison, though he did not appear to attach to what he had said any meaning which alarmed him.

He was to reach Windsor the next day; on leaving Farnham, however, he declared that he would stop at Bagshot, and dine in the forest, at lord Newburgh's, one of his most faithful cavaliers. Harrison dared not refuse, though so much

eagerness inspired him with some suspicions. They were well founded; lord Newburgh, a great amateur of horses, had one which was considered the fleetest in all England; for a long time past, in secret correspondence with the king, he had persuaded him to lame the horse he rode, promising him one with which it would be easy for him to escape suddenly from his escort and baffle all pursuit through the bye-paths of the forest, with which the king was well acquainted. Accordingly, from Farnham to Bagshot, Charles was constantly complaining of his horse, saying that he would change it; but on arriving at lord Newburgh's, he found that the one he had relied upon had been so severely kicked in the stable, that it was altogether unavailable. Lord Newburgh, greatly concerned, offered others to the king, which he said were excellent, and would answer every purpose. But even with the fleetest the attempt would have been perilous; for the troopers kept close to the king, and each carried a cocked pistol in his hand. Charles readily abandoned the idea of running such risks; and in the evening, on arriving at Windsor, delighted to re-enter one of his own palaces, to occupy one of his own chambers, to find all things prepared to receive him nearly the same as heretofore when he came with his court to spend some holidays in that beautiful palace, far from being tormented by any sinister presages, he seemed almost to have forgotten that he was a prisoner.¹

The same day (Dec. 23),² almost at the same moment, the commons voted that he should be brought to trial, and appointed a committee to draw up his impeachment. Notwithstanding the small number of members present, several voices rose against the measure. Some demanded that they should limit themselves to deposing him, as their predecessors had done with some of his; others, without expressing it, would have wished him to be got rid of privately; so as to profit by his death without having to answer for it. But the daring free-thinkers, the sincere fanatics, the rigid republicans, insisted upon a solemn public trial, which should prove their power and proclaim their right.³ Cromwell alone, in reality more eager for it than any other person, still hypocritically affected

¹ Herbert, 93, &c.; Clarendon, iii. 377; Rushworth, ii. 4, 1375; Whitelocke, 368.

² Parl. Hist. iii. 1252.

³ Whitelocke *ut sup*; Clarendon, iii. 380.

moderation. "If any one," he said,¹ "had moved this upon design, I should think him the greatest traitor in the world; but since Providence and necessity have cast us upon it, I pray God to bless our counsels, though I am not prepared on the sudden to give my advice." By one of those strange but invincible scruples, in which iniquity betrays itself while seeking a disguise, in order not to bring the king to trial without a law in the name of which he could be condemned, the house voted (Jan. 2)² as a principle, that he had been guilty of treason in making war against the parliament; and on the motion of Scott,³ an ordinance was forthwith adopted, instituting a high court⁴ to try him. One hundred and fifty commissioners were to compose it: six peers, three high judges, eleven baronets, ten knights, six aldermen of London, all the important men of the party, in the army, the commons, in the city, except St. John and Vane, who formally declared that they disapproved of the act, and would not take any part in it. When the ordinance was presented for the sanction of the upper house (Jan. 2), some pride seemed to revive in that assembly, hitherto so servile that they seemed to have fully admitted their own nothingness: "There is no parliament without the king," maintained lord Manchester; "therefore the king cannot commit treason against parliament." "It has pleased the commons," said lord Denbigh, "to put my name to their ordinance; but I would be torn to pieces rather than take part in so infamous a business." "I do not like, said the earl of Pembroke, "to meddle with affairs of life and death; I shall neither speak against the ordinance nor consent to it;" and the lords present, twelve in number, unanimously rejected it.⁵ Next day, receiving no message from the lords, the commons appointed two of their members to go to the upper house, to have its journals laid before them, and to ascertain what resolution it had come to.⁶ On their report (Jan. 4), they immediately voted that the opposition of the lords should not constitute an obstacle; that the people being, after God, the source of all legitimate power, the commons of England, elected by and representing the people, possessed the sovereign power; and by a fresh ordinance (Jan 6),⁷ the high

¹ Walker, 2, 54.² Parl. Hist. iii. 1253.³ Walker, 2, 55.⁴ Parl. Hist., iii. 1254.⁵ Ib. 1256.⁶ Ib.⁷ Ib. 1257.

court of justice, instituted in the name of the commons only, and reduced to one hundred and thirty-five members,¹ received orders to meet without delay to arrange the preliminaries.

They met accordingly for this purpose in private, on the 8th, 10th, 12th, 13th, 15th, 17th, 18th, and 19th of January, John Bradshaw, a cousin of Milton, and an eminent advocate, presiding—a man grave and gentle in his manners but of a narrow, austere mind, a sincere fanatic and yet ambitious, inclined to avarice though ready to lay down his life for his opinions. Such was the state of public feeling, that insurmountable dissension prevailed even in this court; no summons, no effort succeeded in collecting at these preparatory meetings more than fifty-eight members: Fairfax attended the first meeting, but no other. Even among those who did attend, several only came to declare their opposition: this was the course pursued, among others, by Algernon Sidney, still young, but already influential in the republican party. Retired for some time to Penshurst castle, the seat of his father lord Leicester, when he heard of his nomination on the high court, he immediately went to London, and in the sittings of the 13th, 15th, and 19th of January, though the question appeared decided, warmly opposed the trial. He above all things dreaded the people's conceiving an aversion for a republic, perhaps a sudden insurrection, which would save the king and lose the commonwealth beyond recall: "No one will stir," cried Cromwell, annoyed at these suggestions; "I tell you, we will cut his head off with the crown upon it." "Do what you please," answered Sidney; "I cannot hinder you; but I certainly will have nothing to do with this affair;" and he went out, and never returned.² At length, consisting only of members who readily accepted their mission, the court entirely occupied itself with arranging

¹ The omission of six peers and the three chief justices, reduced the original number of commissioners to one hundred and forty-one; two lawyers, Bradshaw and Nicholas, were added, which made it one hundred and forty-three. Yet the second ordinance contains only one hundred and thirty-five names; there were doubtless other omissions which they did not take the trouble to explain. Alderman Roland Wilson, for instance, refused to participate in the trial, and his name is not found in the second list.—White-locke, 366.

² Leicester's Journal, April; Godwin, Hist. of the Commonwealth, ii. 689.

the form of the trial. John Cook, a counsellor of some reputation and the intimate friend of Milton, was appointed attorney-general, and as such was charged to take the lead in drawing up the act of accusation, and in supporting it on the trial. Elsynge, who had been clerk of the commons up to this period, having retired under pretext of illness, Henry Scobell was selected to take his place. They carefully discussed what regiments and how many should be on service during the trial; where sentinels should be stationed—some were placed even on the leads, and at every window which looked upon the hall—what barriers should be erected to keep the people apart, not only from the tribunal, but also from the soldiers. The 20th of January was appointed for the king to appear before the court at Westminster hall; and so early as the 17th, as if his condemnation had already been pronounced, the commons had charged a committee to visit the palaces, castles, and residences of the king, and to draw up an exact inventory of his furniture, henceforth the property of parliament.¹

When colonel Whychcott, governor of Windsor, told the king that in a few days he would be transferred to London—"God is everywhere," answered Charles, "alike in wisdom, power, and goodness."² Yet the news inspired him with great and unexpected uneasiness; he had lived for the last three weeks in the most unwonted feeling of security, rarely and incorrectly informed of the resolutions of the house, comforting himself with some reports from Ireland which promised him speedy assistance, and more confident, gayer even, than his seryants had for a long time seen him: "In six months," he said, "peace will be re-established in England; if not, I shall receive from Ireland, Denmark, and other kingdoms, the means of righting me;"³ and another day he said: "I have three more cards to play, the worst of which may give me back everything."⁴ And yet one circumstance had lately disturbed him; until almost the close of his stay at Windsor he had been treated and served with all the etiquette of court; he dined in public, in the hall of state, under a canopy; the chamberlain, esquire-carver, maître-d'hotel, and cup-

¹ Parl. Hist. iii. 1259; State Trials, iv. 1045—1067.

² Herbert, 105.

³ Whitelocke, 306.

⁴ Leicester's Journal; Godwin, History of the Commonwealth, 600.

bearer performed their accustomed offices in the accustomed manner; the cup was presented to him kneeling, the dishes were brought in covered, were tasted, and he enjoyed with tranquil gravity these solemn manifestations of respect. All at once, on the reception of a letter from head-quarters, there was a total change; the dishes were brought in uncovered by soldiers, were no longer tasted, none knelt to him, the habitual etiquette of the canopy completely ceased. Charles bitterly grieved at this: "The respect and honour denied me," said he, "no sovereign prince ever wanted, nor even subjects of high degree, according to ancient practice; is there anything more contemptible than a despised prince?" and to avoid this insult he took his repasts in his own room, almost alone, himself selecting two or three dishes from the list presented to him.¹

On Friday, the 19th of January, a troop of horse appeared at Windsor, with Harrison at its head, appointed to remove the king; a coach and six waited in the yard of the castle; Charles entered it, and a few hours after once more re-entered London and St. James's palace; surrounded on all sides by guards, with two sentinels at the very door of his chamber, and Herbert, who slept by his bed-side, alone to serve him.²

Next day, the 20th, towards noon, the high court, assembled in a secret sitting in the painted chamber, arranged the final details of their task; they had scarcely finished prayers, when it was announced that the king, carried in a sedan between two ranks of soldiers, was at hand; Cromwell ran to the window, and turning round, pale, yet very animated: "My masters, he is come—he is come!" he cried; "and now we are doing that great work that the whole nation will be full of; therefore, I desire you to let us resolve here what answer we shall give the king, when he comes before us; for the first question he will ask us will be, by what authority and commission we do try him." No one for awhile answered; at last Henry Martyn³ said: "In the name of the commons and parliament assembled, and of all the good people of England."

¹ Herbert, 109.

² Herbert, 110; Rushworth, ii. 4, 1395; State Trials, v. 1010; Nutley's evidence in Harrison's trial.

³ State Trials, v. 1201; sir Purbeck Temple's evidence in the trial of Henry Martyn.

No objection was made, and the court proceeded in solemn order to Westminster hall, the lord-president, Bradshaw, at their head, with the sword and mace before him, preceded by sixteen officers armed with partisans. The president took his seat in a chair of crimson velvet; below him was the clerk of the house, at a table with a rich Turkey cover on which were placed the mace and sword; to the right and left, on seats of scarlet cloth, sat the members of the court; at the two extremities were men-at-arms, who stood somewhat in advance of the tribunal. The court having taken their seats, the doors were opened and the crowd rushed in; silence being restored, and the act of the commons read which authorized the court, the names were called over; there were sixty-nine members present. "Mr. sergeant," said Bradshaw, "bring in the prisoner."¹

The king appeared, under the guard of colonel Hacker and thirty-two officers; a chair of crimson velvet was prepared for him at the bar: he advanced, cast a long and severe look on the tribunal, sat down in the chair without removing his hat, suddenly rose again, looked behind him at the guard placed at the left, and the crowded spectators at the right of the hall, once more turned his eyes towards the judges, and then sat down amidst universal silence.

Bradshaw rose immediately: "Charles Stuart, king of England," said he, "the commons of England, assembled in parliament, taking notice of the effusion of blood in the land, which is fixed on you as the author of it, and whereof you are guilty, have resolved to bring you to a trial and judgment, and for this cause the tribunal is erected. The charges will now be read by the solicitor-general."

The attorney-general, Cook, then rose to speak: "Silence!" said the king, touching him with his cane on his shoulder. Cook turned round, surprised and irritated; the head of the king's cane fell off; a short but violent emotion appeared in his features; none of his servants were near enough to pick up the head of the cane for him; he stooped, took it up himself, sat down, and Cook read the act of accusation, which, imputing to the king all the evils arising, first from his

¹ Most of the facts of the king's trial are taken from two cotemporary accounts inserted in the State Trials, iv. 989—1154, to which the reader is referred once for all.

tyranny, then from the war, demanded that he should be bound to answer the charges brought against him, and that justice should be done upon him as a tyrant, traitor, and murderer.

While this was reading, the king, still seated, looked tranquilly, sometimes on the judges, sometimes on the public; once, for a moment, he rose, turned his back to the tribunal to look behind him, and sat down again with an air at once of curiosity and indifference. He smiled at the words "Charles Stuart, tyrant, traitor, and murderer," but said nothing.

When Cook had finished: "Sir," said Bradshaw to the king, "you have heard the charge; the court awaits your answer."

The king: "I do wonder for what cause you convene me here. But lately I was in the Isle of Wight, and there I was treated with by divers honourable persons, lords and commons, as to a treaty of peace, and the treaty was nigh perfection. I desire to know by what authority I was hurried thence hither; I mean lawful authority, for there are many unlawful powers, such as that of highwaymen. I desire to know this, I say, before I answer your charge.

Bradshaw: "If you had pleased to pay attention to what the court said to you on your arrival, you would know what that authority is: They desire you, in the name of the English people, of whom you were elected king, to answer."

The king: "No, sir; this I deny."

Bradshaw: "If you demur to the jurisdiction of the court, I must let you know the court overrules your demurrer. You must plead, or the court will take the charge *pro confesso*."

The king: "I tell you, England never was an elective kingdom; that it has been for more than a thousand years an hereditary kingdom. Let me, then, know really by what authority I am summoned here. There is lieutenant-colonel Cobbett; ask him whether it was not by force he brought me from the Isle of Wight. I will uphold, as much as any here, the just privileges of the house of commons. But I see no lords here: where are the lords that should go to make up a parliament?¹ A king, also, is essential. Is this what you call bringing the king to his parliament?"

¹ State Trials, v. 1091; in Cook's trial, evidence given by Nutley.

Bradshaw: "Sir, the court awaits from you a definitive answer. If what we tell you of our authority is not sufficient for you, it is sufficient for us; we know it is founded on the authority of God and of the kingdom."

The king: "It is neither my opinion nor yours that is to decide."

Bradshaw: "The court have heard you; you will be disposed of according to their orders. Take away the prisoner. The court adjourns to Monday next."

The court retired; the king departed with the same escort that brought him. As he got up, he looked at the sword placed upon the table: "I do not fear that," said he, pointing to it with his cane. As he went down stairs, a few voices were heard to cry—"Justice! justice!" but a far greater number shouted—"God save the king! God save your majesty!"

On the Monday, at the sitting of the court sixty two members being present, the court commanded that entire silence should be observed, under pain of imprisonment; but, nevertheless, when the king arrived he was hailed with loud acclamations. The same discussion was renewed on both sides with equal pertinacity. "Sir," Bradshaw at length said, "neither you nor any one else will be allowed to dispute the jurisdiction of this court; they sit here by the supreme authority of the nation, the commons assembled in parliament to whom your ancestors ever were, and to whom you are, accountable."

The king: "By your favour, show me one precedent."

Bradshaw rose angrily, and said: "Sir, we sit not here to answer your questions. Plead to the charge; guilty, or not guilty?"

The king: "You have not heard my reasons."

Bradshaw: "Sir, you have no reasons to give against the highest of all jurisdictions."

The king: "Then show me this jurisdiction, in which reason is not heard."

Bradshaw: "Sir, we show it to you here; it is the commons of England. Sergeant, take away the prisoner!"

The king turned suddenly round towards the people, and

¹ State Trials, v. 1086, in the trial of the regicides, and particularly in that of Cook; John Herne's evidence.

said: "Remember that the king of England suffers, being not permitted to give his reasons for the liberty of the people!" and an almost general cry arose: "God save the king!"¹

The next sitting, on the 23rd of January, exhibited the same scenes; the sympathy of the people for the king became daily more earnest; in vain did the irritated officers and soldiers shout the menacing cry of "Justice! Execution!" the intimidated crowd were silent for a moment; but, upon some fresh incident, forgot their alarm, and "God save the king!" echoed on all sides. It was even heard among the troops: on the 23rd, as the king was leaving after the rising of the court, a soldier of the guard cried aloud, "Sire, God bless you!" An officer struck him with his cane. "Sir," said the king, "the punishment exceeds the offence."² At the same time representations were sent from abroad, and proceedings taken, not very formidable, it is true, and most of them not very urgent, but still fanning the flame of public indignation. The French minister delivered to the commons (Jan. 3) a letter from the queen, Henrietta-Maria, soliciting permission to come and join her husband, either to persuade him to yield to their wishes or to give him the consolations of affection.³ The prince of Wales wrote to Fairfax and to the council of officers, in the hope of awakening in their breasts some feeling of loyalty.⁴ The Scottish commissioners officially protested in the name of that kingdom, against all that was going on (Jan. 6 and 22).⁵ The early arrival of an extraordinary embassy from the States, sent to interpose in the king's favour, was announced; already John Cromwell, an officer in the service of the Dutch, and cousin to Oliver, was in London, besetting the lieutenant-general with almost threatening reproaches.⁶ The printing of a manuscript entitled *Royal Sighs*, the production, it was said, of the king himself, and of a nature to excite an insurrection for his deliverance, was discovered and its publication stopped.⁷ On all sides, in

¹ State Trials, v. 1086.

² Herbert, 114.

³ Clarendon, ii. 368.

⁴ *Ib.* 296.

⁵ Parl. Hist. iii. 1277, &c.

⁶ Banks, *Critical Review*, &c., 103; Mark Noble, *Memoirs of the Protectoral House*, &c., i. 50.

⁷ The famous Εὐκὼν Βασιλεῖ.

a word, if not great obstacles, at least new causes of fermentation arose, which would assuredly disappear, the republicans promised themselves, as soon as the question should be put to an end; but which, so long as it remained in suspense, rendered every day's delay more embarrassing and perilous.

They resolved to relieve themselves at once from this situation, to cut short any further debate, and that the king should only appear again to receive his sentence. Whether from a lingering respect for legal forms, or to produce, if required, new proofs of Charles's bad faith in the negotiations, the court employed the 24th and 25th in collecting evidence from thirty-two witnesses. On the 25th, at the close of their sitting, and almost without any discussion, they voted the king's condemnation as a tyrant, traitor, murderer, and enemy to the country. Scott, Martyn, Harrison, Lisle, Say, Ireton, and Love, were charged to draw up the sentence. There were only forty-six members present that day. On the 26th, sixty-two members being assembled with closed doors, the form of the sentence was determined upon after some discussion. The court adjourned to the following day, then to pronounce it. On the 27th, at noon, after two hours' conference in the painted chamber, the sitting began, according to custom, by calling over the names; when Fairfax's was called. "He has too much wit to be here!" exclaimed the voice of a woman from the gallery. After a moment's surprise and hesitation, the clerk proceeded: sixty-seven members were present. When the king entered the hall, a violent cry of "Execution! Justice! Execution!" was raised. The soldiers were very excited, Axtell, who commanded them, animating their shouts; a few groups scattered here and there about the hall joined in these clamours; but the crowd was silent and in consternation.

"Sir," said the king to Bradshaw, before he sat down, "I shall ask to speak a word; I hope I shall not give you occasion to interrupt me."

Bradshaw: "You shall answer in your turn; first listen to the court."

The king: "Sir, by your favour, I desire to be heard. It is but a word. An immediate judgment"

Bradshaw: "Sir, you shall be heard in fit time; you must first hear the court."

The king: "Sir, I desire . . . what I have to say is concerning that which the court is, I think, about to pronounce; and it is not easy, sir, to recall a precipitate judgment."

Bradshaw: "You will be heard, sir, before judgment is passed. Till then you must abstain from speaking."

On hearing this promise some serenity re-appeared on the king's countenance; he sat down: Bradshaw went on:

"Gentlemen, it is well known to you all that the prisoner here at the bar has several times been brought before the court to answer a charge of high treason and other great crimes, brought against him in the name of the people of England—"

"It's a lie! Not one half of them," cried the same voice which had answered at the name of Fairfax: "Where are they or their consents? Oliver Cromwell is a traitor!"

The whole assembly was startled: all eyes were turned towards the gallery. "Down with the w—," cried Axtell; "shoot them!" The speaker was soon found to be lady Fairfax.¹

A general excitement arose: the soldiers, though numerously interspersed with the crowd, and using little ceremony, had much difficulty in repressing it: order being at length somewhat re-established, Bradshaw recited the king's obstinate refusal to answer to the charge, the notoriety of the crimes imputed to him, and then declared that the court were agreed as to the sentence, but consented, before pronouncing it, to hear the prisoner's defence, provided he would desist from denying their jurisdiction.

"I ask," said the king, "to be heard in the painted chamber, by the lords and commons, on a proposal which is of far greater importance to the peace of the kingdom and the liberty of my subjects than to my own preservation."

Deep agitation pervaded the court and the assembly: friends and enemies all endeavoured to imagine with what intention the king requested this conference with the two houses, and what he could have to propose to them; a thousand different suggestions went about; the majority seemed

¹ State Trials, 1150; Evidence of sir Purbeck Temple.

to think that he wished to abdicate the crown in favour of his son. But whatever it might be that he intended, the perplexity of the court was extreme; the party, notwithstanding their triumph, did not feel itself in a position either to lose time or to run fresh hazards; among the judges themselves, some indecision was perceptible. To escape the peril, Bradshaw maintained that the king's request was only a trick still to escape the jurisdiction of the court; a long and close debate took place between them on this subject. Charles again and again insisted, more and more urgently, on being heard; but on each occasion the soldiers round him became more and more noisy and abusive; some lit their pipes and blew the smoke towards him; others murmured in coarse terms at the slowness of the trial; Axtell laughed and joked aloud. In vain did the king several times turn towards them, and sometimes by gesture, sometimes by words seek to obtain a few moments of attention or at least of silence; he was answered by the cries: "Justice! Execution!" At length, deeply agitated, almost beside himself: "Hear me! hear me!" he cried, in passionate accents; the same shouts were renewed: suddenly an unexpected movement exhibited itself among the judges. Colonel Downs, one of the members of the court, became violently agitated and sought to rise from his chair; in vain did the colleague on each side, Cawley and colonel Wanton, seek to keep him down, and compose him: "Have we hearts of stone?" he said; "are we men?" "You will ruin us and yourself," said Cawley. "No matter," replied Downs, "if I die for it, I must do it." On hearing this, Cromwell, who sat beneath him, suddenly turned round: "Colonel," said he, "are you yourself? What mean you? Can't you be quiet?" "Sir," answered Downs; "no, I cannot be quiet;" and immediately rising, he said to the president: "My lord, I am not satisfied to give my consent to this sentence, and have reasons to offer to you against it, and I desire the court may adjourn to hear me, and deliberate." "If any one of the court," gravely answered Bradshaw, "be unsatisfied, the court must adjourn;" and they all immediately passed into an adjoining room.

They were no sooner there than Cromwell roughly assailed

¹ State Trials, v. 1150, 1151; in Axtell's Trial.

the colonel, upbraiding him for the difficulty and confusion in which he was involving the court. Downs defended himself with agitation, alleging that perhaps the king's proposals would be satisfactory, that, after all, what they had sought, what they still sought, were good and solid guarantees; that they ought not to refuse, without knowing what they were, those which the king wished to offer; that they owed it to him at least to hear him, and to respect, in his person, the ordinary rules of common justice. Cromwell heard him with rude impatience, moving round and round him, and interrupting him at every word: "At last," said he, "we see what great reason the gentleman had to put such a trouble and disturbance upon us; sure, he doth not know that he hath to do with the hardest hearted man that lives upon the earth. However, it is not fit that the court should be hindered from their duty by one peevish man. The bottom of all this is known; he would fain save his old master; let us, without more ado, go back and do our duty." In vain did colonel Harvey and some others support the opinion of Downs; the discussion was speedily repressed; in half an hour, the court returned to the hall, and Bradshaw declared to the king that they rejected his proposition.¹

Charles seemed quite overcome, and renewed the application but hesitatingly; "If you have nothing more to say," said Bradshaw, "we shall proceed to sentence." "Sir, I have nothing more to say," replied the king; "but I shall desire that what I have said may be entered." Bradshaw, without answering, told him he was about to hear his sentence; but before having it read, he addressed to the king a long speech, a solemn apology for the conduct of parliament, in which all the king's faults were set forth, and all the evils of the civil war cast upon him alone, since his tyranny had made resistance a duty as well as a necessity. His language was stern, bitter, but grave, godly, free from insult, the result of a conviction evidently profound, though blended with somewhat of vindictive emotion. The king listened without interrupting him, grave as himself. Yet, as the speech drew near its conclusion, a visible agitation took

¹ State Trials, v. 1197, 1205, 1211, 1218; in the trials of Harvey, Robert Lilburne, Downes, and Wayte, and from the narrative of the accused themselves.

possession of him; as soon as Bradshaw stopped, he attempted to speak. Bradshaw opposed it, and gave orders to the clerk to read the sentence; when he had done: "The sentence now read and published," he said, "is the act, sentence, judgment, and resolution of the whole court;" and the whole court stood up in sign of assent. "Sir," suddenly exclaimed the king, "will you hear me a word?"

Bradshaw: "Sir, you are not to be heard after the sentence."

The king: "No, sir?"

Bradshaw: "No, sir, by your favour. Guards, withdraw the prisoner!"

The king: "I may speak after sentence, by your favour, sir; I may speak after my sentence, ever. By your favour." ("Hold!" said Bradshaw.) "The sentence, sir,—I say, sir, I do—I am not suffered to speak: expect what justice other people will have!"

The soldiers here surrounded him, and removing him from the bar, carried him with violence to the place where his sedan waited for him; as he went down the stairs, he had to endure the grossest insults; some threw their lighted pipes in his way; others blew the smoke of their tobacco in his face; all cried close to him, "Justice! execution!" Yet the people still mixed up with these cries, the shout, "God save your majesty! God deliver your majesty from the hands of your enemies!" and till he had seated himself in the sedan, the bearers stood with their hats off, notwithstanding Axtell's orders to the contrary, who even struck them for their disobedience. They set out for Whitehall; the troops lined each side of the road; before the shops, at every door, every window, there was a crowd of people, most of them silent, some weeping, others praying aloud for the king. Every few minutes, the soldiers, to celebrate their triumph, renewed the cry, "Justice! Justice! Execution!" But Charles had regained his accustomed serenity; and, too proud to believe in

¹ State Trials, v. 1151, in Axtell's trial. A witness deposed, on the trial of Augustin Garland, one of the judges, that he had seen him at the foot of the stairs spit in the king's face. Garland absolutely denied it, and the judges did not insist. Herbert, who accompanied the king, does not mention it either. I have not, therefore, thought proper to mention it as authentic, though Warwick, who had almost all the details inserted in his memoirs from bishop Juxon, expressly affirms it.

the sincerity of their hatred, said, as he came out of the chair: "Poor souls, for a piece of money they would do so for their commanders!"¹

As soon as he arrived at Whitehall; "Hark ye!" said he to Herbert, "my nephew, the prince elector, and some other lords that love me, will endeavour to see me, which I would take in good part, but my time is short and precious, and I am desirous to improve it the best I may; I wish to employ it in preparation; I hope they will not take it ill, that none have access to me but my children. The best office they can now do me is to pray for me." He asked to see his younger children, the princess Elizabeth and the duke of Gloucester, who had remained in charge of parliament, and Juxon, bishop of London, of whom he had already, through the intervention of Hugh Peters, obtained religious assistance. Both requests were granted. Next day, the 28th, the bishop went to St. James's, whither Charles had been transferred; when he saw the king, he burst into an agony of grief: "Leave off this, my lord," said Charles; "we have not time for it; let us think of our great work, and prepare to meet that great God, to whom, ere long, I am to give an account of myself. I hope I shall do it with peace, and that you will assist me therein. We will not talk of these rogues, in whose hands I am; they thirst after my blood, and they will have it, and God's will be done! I thank God, I heartily forgive them; and I will talk of them no more." He passed the rest of the day in pious conference with the bishop; it was with great difficulty he obtained permission to be left alone in his room, where, at first, colonel Hacker had posted two soldiers; and, as it was, all the while Juxon was with him, the door was opened every few minutes by the sentinel on duty, to make sure that the king was there. As he had anticipated, his nephew the prince-elector, the duke of Richmond, the marquis of Hertford, the earls of Southampton and Lindsey, and other old servants, came to see him; but he did not receive them. Mr. Seymour, a gentleman in the service of the prince of Wales, arrived the same day from the Hague,²

¹ State Trials, IV. 1130; Herbert, Memoirs, 114.

² According to Tomlinson's evidence (State Trials, v. 1179), it was on the day of his death, and at Whitehall, that the king received Mr. Seymour; I have followed Herbert's account—Memoirs, *ut sup.*

bearer of a letter from the prince; the king ordered him to be admitted, read the letter, threw it into the fire, gave his answer to the messenger, and sent him away immediately. Next day, the 29th, almost at dawn of day, the bishop returned to St. James's. Morning prayer over, the king produced a box, containing broken crosses of the order of St. George and of the garter: "You see," he said to Juxon, "all the wealth now in my power to give my two children." The children were then brought to him; on seeing her father, the princess Elizabeth, twelve years old, burst into tears; the duke of Gloucester, who was only eight, wept also when he saw his sister weeping; Charles took them upon his knees, divided his jewels between them, consoled his daughter, gave her advice as to the books she was to read to strengthen herself against popery, charged her to tell her brothers that he had forgiven his enemies, her mother that in thought he had ever been with her, and that to the last hour he loved her as dearly as on their marriage day; then turning towards the little duke: "My dear heart," he said, "they will soon cut off thy father's head." The child looked at him fixedly and earnestly: "Mark, child, what I say; they will cut off my head, and perhaps make thee king; but mark what I say, thou must not be king so long as thy brothers Charles and James live, but they will cut off thy brothers' heads if they can catch them; and thine, too, they will cut off at last! Therefore, I charge thee, do not be made a king by them." "I will be torn in pieces first!" replied the child, with great emotion. Charles fervently kissed him, put him down, kissed his daughter, blessed them both, and called upon God to bless them; then suddenly rising: "Have them taken away," he said to Juxon; the children sobbed aloud; the king, standing with his head pressed against the window, tried to suppress his tears; the door opened, the children were going out, Charles ran from the window, took them again in his arms, blessed them once more, and at last tearing himself from their caresses, fell upon his knees and began to pray with the bishop and Herbert, the only witnesses of this deeply painful scene.¹

On the same morning the high court had met, and ap-

¹ Rushworth, ii. 4, 1398. Journals, Commons, Jan. 20

pointed the execution to take place next day, January 30, between ten and five o'clock; but when it became necessary to sign the fatal order, it was with great difficulty the commissioners could be got together; in vain two or three of the most determined stood outside the door, stopped such of their colleagues as were passing by towards the house of commons, and called upon them to come and affix their names.¹ Several even of those who had voted for the condemnation kept out of the way, or expressly refused to sign. Cromwell himself, gay, noisy, daring as ever, gave way to his usual coarse buffoonery; after having signed himself—he was the third to do so—he smeared with ink Henry Martyn's face who sat by him, and who immediately did the same to him. Colonel Ingoldsby, his cousin, who had been appointed a member of the court, but had never taken his seat, accidentally came into the hall: "This time," said Cromwell, "he shall not escape;" and, laughing aloud, he seized Ingoldsby, and with the assistance of a few other members, put the pen between his fingers, and guiding his hand, obliged him to sign.² Fifty-nine signatures were at last collected; many, either from agitation or design, such mere scrawls that it was almost impossible to make them out. The order was addressed to colonel Hacker, colonel Huncks, and lieutenant Phayre, who were charged to see to the execution. Hitherto the ambassadors extraordinary from the States, Albert Joachim and Adrien Pauw, who had been five days in London, had vainly solicited an audience of parliament; neither their official request, nor their private applications to Fairfax, Cromwell, and some other officers, had obtained it for them. They were suddenly informed, about one o'clock, that they would be received at two by the lords, at three by the commons. They went immediately, and delivered their message; an answer was promised them, and as they returned to their lodgings they saw commencing, in front of Whitehall, the preparations for the execution. They had received visits from the French and Spanish ambassadors, but neither would join in their proceedings; the first satisfied himself with protesting, that for a

¹ State Trials, v. 1219; Thomas Wayte's trial.

² Harris, *Life of Cromwell*, 201; Mark Noble's *Memoirs of the Protectoral House*, 1118.

long time past he had foreseen this deplorable event and done all in his power to avert it; the other said he had not yet received orders from his court to interfere in the matter, though he every hour expected them. Next day, the 30th, about twelve, a second interview with Fairfax, in the house of his secretary, gave the Dutch ambassadors a gleam of hope; the general had been moved by their representations, and, seeming at length resolved to rouse himself from his inaction, promised to go immediately to Westminster, to solicit at least a reprieve. But as they left him, before the very house in which they had conversed with him, they met a body of cavalry, clearing the way; all the avenues to Whitehall, all the adjacent streets, were equally filled with them; on all sides they heard it said that everything was ready, and that the king would soon arrive.¹

And so it was: early in the morning, in a room at Whitehall, beside the bed from which Ireton and Harrison had not yet risen, Cromwell, Hacker, Huncks, Axtell, and Phayre had assembled to draw up the last act of this fearful proceeding, the order to the executioner. "Colonel," said Cromwell to Huncks, "it is you who must write and sign it." Huncks obstinately refused: "What a stubborn grumbler!" said Cromwell. "Colonel Huncks," said Axtell, "I am ashamed of you; the ship is now coming into the harbour, and will you strike sail before we come to anchor?" Huncks persisted in his refusal; Cromwell, muttering between his teeth, sat down, wrote the order himself and presented it to colonel Hacker, who signed it without objection.²

Nearly at the same moment, after four hours' profound sleep, Charles left his bed: "I have a great work to do this day," he said to Herbert; "I must get up immediately;" and he sat down at his dressing-table. Herbert, in his agitation, combed his hair with less care than usual: "I pray you,"

¹ These details are taken from the correspondence of the ambassadors themselves with the States, of which a translation is appended to the present volume. They prove how doubtful, notwithstanding Herbert's narrative, whom in other respects Mr. Godwin is wrong in disbelieving, is the anecdote after which almost all the historians have related that Ireton and Harrison had passed the time in prayers with Fairfax to conceal from him what was going on.

² State Trials, v. 1148—1180; Axtell and Hacker's trial.

said the king, "though my head be not long to remain on my shoulders, take the same pains with it as usual; let me be as trim to-day as may be; this is my second marriage day; for before night I hope to be espoused to my blessed Jesus." As he was dressing, he asked to have a shirt on more than ordinary: "The season is so sharp," he said, "as may make me shake, which some observers will imagine proceeds from fear. I would have no such imputation; I fear not death; death is not terrible to me. I bless my God I am prepared." At daybreak the bishop arrived and commenced the holy service; as he was reading, in the 27th chapter of the gospel according to St. Matthew, the passion of Jesus Christ, the king asked him: "My lord, did you choose this chapter as being applicable to my present condition?" "May it please your majesty," said the bishop, "it is the proper lesson for the day, as the calendar indicates." The king appeared deeply affected, and continued his prayers with even greater fervour. Towards ten, a gentle knock was heard at the door; Herbert did not stir; a second knock was heard, rather louder, but still gentle: "Go and see who is there," said the king: it was colonel Hacker: "Let him come in," said the king. "Sir," said the colonel, with a low and half-trembling voice, "it is time to go to Whitehall; but you will have some further time to rest there." "I will go directly," answered Charles; "leave me." Hacker went out: the king occupied a few moments more in mental prayer; then, taking the bishop by the hand: "Come," said he, "let us go; Herbert, open the door, Hacker is knocking again;" and he went down into the park, through which he was to proceed to Whitehall.

Several companies of infantry were drawn up there, forming a double line on each side of his way; a detachment of halberdiers marched on before, with banners flying; the drums beat; not a voice could be heard for the noise. On the right of the king was the bishop; on the left, uncovered, colonel Tomlinson, the officer in command of the guard, whom Charles touched by his attentions, had requested not to leave him till the last moment. He talked with him, on the way, of his funeral, of the persons to whom he wished the care of it to be entrusted, his countenance serene, his eye

beaming, his step firm, walking even faster than the troops, and blaming their slowness. One of the officers on service, doubtless thinking to agitate him, asked him whether he had not concurred with the late duke of Buckingham in the death of the king his father: "Friend," answered Charles, with gentle contempt, "if I had no other sin, I speak it with reverence to God's majesty, I assure thee I should never ask him pardon."¹ Arrived at Whitehall he ascended the stairs with a light step, passed through the great gallery into his bed-room, where he was left alone with the bishop, who was preparing to administer the sacrament. Some independent ministers, Nye and Goodwin among others, came and knocked at the door, saying that they wished to offer their services to the king: "The king is at prayers," answered Juxon: they still insisted. "Well, then," said Charles to the bishop, "thank them from me for the tender of themselves, but tell them plainly, that they that so often causelessly prayed against me, shall not pray with me in this agony. They may, if they please, I'll thank them for it, pray for me." They retired; the king knelt, received the communion from the hands of the bishop, then rising with cheerfulness: "Now," said he, "let the rogues come; I have heartily forgiven them, and am prepared for all I am to undergo." His dinner had been prepared; he declined taking any: "Sire," said Juxon, "your majesty has long been fasting; it is cold; perhaps on the scaffold some faintness——." "You are right," said the king, and he took a piece of bread and a glass of wine. It was now one o'clock: Hacker knocked at the door; Juxon and Herbert fell on their knees: "Rise, my old friend," said Charles, holding out his hand to the bishop. Hacker knocked again; Charles ordered the door to be opened: "Go on," said he, "I follow you." He advanced through the banqueting hall, still between a double rank of soldiers; a multitude of men and women, who had rushed in at the peril of their lives, stood motionless behind the guard, praying for the king as he passed, uninterrupted by the soldiers, themselves quite silent. At the extremity of the hall an opening made in the wall led straight upon the scaffold, which was hung with black; two men, dressed as sailors and masked, stood

¹ Warwick, 342.

by the axe. The king stepped out, his head erect, and looking around for the people, to address them; but the troops occupied the whole space, so that none could approach: he turned towards Juxon and Tomlinson: "I cannot be heard by many but yourselves," he said, "therefore to you I will address a few words;" and he delivered to them a short speech which he had prepared, grave and calm, even to coldness, its sole purport being to show that he had acted right, that contempt of the rights of the sovereign was the true cause of the people's misfortunes, that the people ought to have no share in the government, that upon this condition alone would the country regain peace and its liberties. While he was speaking, some one touched the axe; he turned round hastily, saying: "Do not spoil the axe, it would hurt me more;" and again, as he was about to conclude his address, some one else again approaching it: "Take care of the axe, take care!" he repeated, in an agitated tone. The most profound silence prevailed: he put a silk cap upon his head, and addressing the executioner, said: "Is my hair in the way?" "I beg your majesty to put it under your cap," replied the man, bowing. The king, with the help of the bishop, did so. "I have on my side a good cause and a merciful God!" he said to his venerable servant. Juxon: "Yes, sire, there is but one stage more: it is full of trouble and anguish, but it is a very short one; and consider, it will carry you a great way; it will carry you from earth to heaven!" The king: "I go from a corruptible to an incorruptible crown, where I shall have no trouble to fear!" and, turning towards the executioner: "Is my hair right?" He took off his cloak and George, and gave the George to Juxon, saying: "Remember."¹ He then took off his coat, put on his cloak again, and looking at the block, said to the executioner: "Place it so it may be firm." "It is firm, sir." The king: "I will say a short prayer, and when I hold out my hands, then . . .

He stood in meditation, murmured a few words to himself, raised his eyes to heaven, knelt down, and laid his head upon the block; the executioner touched his hair to put it still further under his cap; the king thought he was going to

¹ It was never known to what the king alluded.

strike: "Wait for the signal," he said. "I shall wait for it, sir, with the good pleasure of your majesty." In a minute the king held out his hands; the executioner struck; the head fell at a blow: "This is the head of a traitor!" cried he, holding it up to the people; a long deep groan arose from the multitude; many persons rushed to the scaffold to dip their handkerchiefs in the king's blood. Two troops of horse advancing in different directions, slowly dispersed the crowd. The scaffold being cleared, the body was taken away: it was already enclosed in the coffin when Cromwell desired to see it; he looked at it attentively, and, raising the head, as if to make sure that it was indeed severed from the body; "This," he said, "was a well-constituted frame, and which promised a long life."¹

The coffin remained exposed for seven days at Whitehall; an immense concourse pressed round the door, but few obtained leave to go in. On the 6th of February, by order of the commons, it was delivered to Herbert and Mildmay, with authority to bury it in Windsor castle, in St. George's chapel, where Henry the Eighth lies. The procession was decent, though without pomp; six horses covered with black cloth drew the bier; four coaches followed, two of which, also hung with black cloth, conveyed the king's latest servants, those who had followed him to the Isle of Wight. Next day, the 8th, with the consent of the commons, the duke of Richmond, the marquis of Hertford, the earls of Southampton and Lindsey, and bishop Juxon, arrived at Windsor, to assist at the funeral; they had engraved on the coffin these words only:

CHARLES, REX,
1648.²

As they were removing the body from the interior of the castle to the chapel, the weather, hitherto clear and serene, changed all at once: snow fell in abundance; it entirely covered the black velvet pall, and the king's servants, with a melancholy satisfaction, viewed in this sudden whiteness of their unhappy

¹ Noble, i. 118.

² Old Style, The English year, not being as yet regulated by the Gregorian Calendar, then began on the 24th of March; January 30th, 1648, the day of Charles's death, corresponds with our 9th of February, 1649.

master's coffin, a symbol of his innocence. On the arrival of the procession at the place selected for sepulture, bishop Juxon was preparing to officiate according to the rites of the English church, but Whycheott, the governor of the castle, would not permit this: "The liturgy decreed by parliament," he said, "is obligatory for the king as for all." They submitted; no religious ceremony took place, and the coffin being lowered into the vault, all left the chapel, and the governor closed the door. The house of commons called for an account of the expense of the obsequies, and allowed five hundred pounds to pay for them. On the day of the king's death, before any express had left London, they published an ordinance, declaring whomsoever should proclaim in his stead and as his successor "Charles Stuart his son, commonly called prince of Wales, or any other person whatsoever, a traitor."¹ On the 6th February, after a long discussion, and notwithstanding a division of twenty-nine to forty-four, the house of lords was solemnly abolished.² Finally, the next day, the 7th, a decree was adopted, running thus: "It hath been found by experience, and this house doth declare, that the office of a king, in this nation, and to have the power thereof in any single person, is unnecessary, burthensome, and dangerous to the liberty, safety, and public interest of the people of this nation, and therefore ought to be abolished;"³ and a new great seal was engraved,⁴ bearing on one side a map of England and Ireland, with the arms of the two countries; and on the reverse, a representation of the house of commons sitting, with this inscription, suggested by Henry Martyn: "The first year of liberty restored by the blessing of God, 1648."

¹ Parl. Hist. iii. 1281.

² Ib. 1284.

³ Ib. 1285.

⁴ The order was given as early as the 9th of February; Parl. Hist. iii.

APPENDIX
OF
ILLUSTRATIONS & HISTORICAL DOCUMENTS.

CONTENTS OF THE APPENDIX.

- I. Symptoms of the spirit of opposition and liberty in the reign of Elizabeth.
- II. Writing found in the hat of Felton, the assassin of the Duke of Buckingham.
- III. Character of the administration of Strafford in Ireland.
- IV. Fines imposed for the benefit of the crown, from 1629 to 1640.
- V. Instructions from the king to the marquis of Hamilton respecting the synod of Glasgow, in 1638.
- VI. Composition of the army raised by the parliament in 1642.
- VII. Employment of catholics in the royal army.
- VIII. Petition against peace from the common council to the house of commons, presented August 7, 1643.
- IX. Petition in favour of peace, from the women of London, presented August 9, 1643.
- X. Declaration and justification of John Pym.
- XI. Letter from the king to prince Rupert, ordering him to relieve York.
- XII. The self-denying ordinance, adopted April 3, 1643.
- XIII. Extract from the minutes of the council held at Oxford, Dec. 5, 1644.
- XIV. Cavalier songs against David Lesley and the Scottish troops recalled from England to the assistance of the Scottish presbyterians, who had been defeated by Montrose.
- XV. Inedited documents and despatches relative to the extraordinary embassy sent to London, January, 1649, from the States-general of the United Provinces, to intercede with the parliament in favour of Charles the First. (Taken from the archives of the Hague.)

APPENDIX

OF

ELUCIDATIONS & HISTORICAL DOCUMENTS.

I.

Symptoms of the Spirit of Opposition and Liberty in the reign of Elizabeth.

In the month of November, 1576, Mr. Peter Wentworth, a member of the house of commons, having made a speech in defence of the privileges of the house, and especially that of liberty of speech, was arrested by order of the queen, and underwent before a committee of the house, on which sat several privy councillors, the following examination, a curious record of the spirit of independence which began to manifest itself at this time, and of the approbation which the very men entrusted with the task of repressing it, felt themselves compelled to accord it.

“COMMITTEE. Where is your late speech you promised to deliver in writing?”

WENTWORTH. Here it is, and I deliver it upon two conditions: first, that you shall peruse it all, and if you can find any want of good will to my prince and state in any part thereof, let me answer all as if I had uttered all. The second is, that you shall deliver it unto the queen's majesty; if her majesty, or you of her privy council, can find any want of love to her majesty or the state therein, also let me answer it.

COMMITTEE. We will deal with no more than you uttered in the house.

WENTWORTH. Your honours cannot refuse to deliver it to her majesty; for I do send it to her majesty as my heart and mind, knowing it will do her majesty good; it will hurt no man but myself.

COMMITTEE. Seeing your desire is to have us deliver it to her majesty, we will deliver it.

WENTWORTH. I humbly require your honours to do so.

[Then, the speech being read, they went on:]

COMMITTEE. Here you have uttered certain rumours of the queen's majesty: where and when heard you them?

WENTWORTH. If your honours ask me as councillors to her majesty, you shall pardon me—I will make you no answer. I will do no such injury.

to the place from whence I came, for I am now no private person, I am a public, and a councillor to the whole state in that place, where it is lawful for me to speak my mind freely; and not for you, as councillors, to call me to account for anything that I do speak in the house; and therefore if you ask me as councillors to her majesty, you shall pardon me, I will make no answer; but if you ask me as committees from the house, I will make you the best answer I can.

COMMITTEE. We ask you as committees from the house.

WENTWORTH. I will then answer you; and the willinger for that mine answer will be in some part so imperfect, as of necessity it must be. Your question consisteth of these two points: where and of whom I heard these rumours. The place where I heard them was the parliament house; but of whom, I assure you, I cannot tell.

COMMITTEE. This is no answer, to say you cannot tell of whom, neither will we take it for any.

WENTWORTH. Truly your honours must needs take it for an answer, when I can make you no better.

COMMITTEE. Belike you have heard some speeches, in the town, of her majesty's misliking of religion and succession; you are loth to utter of whom, and did use speeches thereupon.

WENTWORTH. I can assure your honours, I can show you that speech at my own house, written with my hand two or three years ago. So that you may thereby judge, that I did not speak it of anything that I heard since I came to town.

COMMITTEE. You have answered that, but where heard you it, then?

WENTWORTH. If your honours do think I speak for excuse sake, let this satisfy you: I protest before the living God, I cannot tell of whom I heard these rumours; yet I do verily think that I heard them of a hundred or two in the house.

COMMITTEE. Then of so many you can name some?

WENTWORTH. No, surely, because it was so general a speech, I marked none; neither do men mark speakers commonly when they be general; and I assure you, if I could tell, I would not. For I will never utter anything told me, to the hurt of any man, when I am not enforced therunto, as in this case I may choose. Yet I would deal plainly with you, for I would tell your honours so, and if your honours do not credit me, I will voluntarily take an oath, if you offer me a book, that I cannot tell of whom I heard those rumours. But if you offer me an oath of your authorities, I will refuse it; because I will do nothing to infringe the liberties of the house. But what need I to use these speeches? I will give you an instance, whereupon I heard these rumours to your satisfying, even such a one as, if you will speak the truth, you shall confess you heard the same as well as I.

COMMITTEE. In so doing, we will be satisfied: what is that?

WENTWORTH. The last parliament [13th Eliz.], he that is now speaker [Robert Bell, Esq.], and who was also speaker in the first session of the present parliament [14th Eliz.], uttered a very good speech for the calling in of certain licences granted to four courtiers to the utter undoing of 8000 or 8000 of the queen's subjects. This speech was so disliked by some of the council, that he was sent for; and so hardly dealt with, that he came into the house with such an amazed countenance, that it daunted all the house in such sort that for ten, twelve, or sixteen days, there was not one

in the house that durst deal in any matter of importance. And in those simple matters that they dealt in, they spent more words and time in their preamble, requiring that they might not be mistaken, than they did in the matter they spake unto. This inconvenience grew unto the house by the council's hard handling of the same good member, wherein this rumour grew in the house: 'Sirs, you may not speak against licences, the queen's majesty will be angry, the privy council, too, will be angry;' and this rumour I suppose there is not one of you here, but heard it as well as I. I beseech your honours discharge your consciences herein as I do.

COMMITTEE. We heard it, we confess, and you have satisfied us in this; but how say you to the hard interpretation you made of the message that was sent into the house. [The words were recited.] We assure you we never heard a harder interpretation of a message.

WENTWORTH. I beseech your honours first, was there not such a message sent into the house?

COMMITTEE. We grant that there was.

WENTWORTH. Then I trust you will bear me record that I made it not; and I answer for that, so hard a message could not have too hard an interpretation made by the wisest man in England. For can there, by any possible means, be sent a harder message to a council gathered together to serve God, than to say: "You shall not seek to advance the glory of God!" I am of this opinion; that there cannot be a more wicked message than it was.

COMMITTEE. You may not speak against messages, for none sendeth them but the queen's majesty.

WENTWORTH. If the message be against the glory of God, against the prince's safety, or against the liberty of this parliament house, whereby the state is maintained, I neither may nor will hold my peace. I cannot, in so doing, discharge my conscience, whosoever doth send it. And I say, that I heartily repent me, for that I have hitherto held my peace in these causes; and I do promise you all, if God forsake me not, that I will never, during life, hold my tongue if any message is sent wherein God is dishonoured, the prince reviled, or the liberties of the parliament impeached; and every one of you here present ought to repent you of these faults, and to amend them.

COMMITTEE. It is no new precedent to have the prince to send messages. [There were two or three messages recited sent by two or three princes.]

WENTWORTH. Sirs, I say you do very ill to allege precedents in this order. You ought to allege good precedents, to comfort and embolden men in good doings, and not evil precedents to discourage and terrify men to do evil.

COMMITTEE. But what meant you to make so hard interpretation of messages?

WENTWORTH. Surely, I marvel what you mean by asking this question. Have I not said, so hard a message could not have too hard an interpretation? And have I not set down the reason that moved me in my speech—that is to say, that for the receiving and accepting that message, God has passed so great indignation upon us, that he put into the queen's heart to refuse good and wholesome laws for her own preservation, which caused many loving and faithful hearts for grief to burst out with sorrowful tears; and moved all papists, traitors to God, to her majesty, and to every good

Christian government, in their sleeves to laugh the whole parliament-house to scorn. Have I not thus said, and do not your honours think it so?

COMMITTEE. Yes, truly. But how durst you say, that the queen had unkindly abused herself against the nobility and people?

WANTWORTH. I beseech your honours, tell me how far you can stretch these words, of her unkindly abusing and opposing herself against her majesty's nobility and people? Can you apply them any further than I have applied them—that is to say, in that her majesty called the parliament on purpose to prevent traitorous perils to her person; and for no other cause; and in that her majesty did send unto us two bills, willing us to take our choice of that we liked best for her majesty's safety, and thereof to make a law, promising her royal consent thereunto; and did we not first choose the one, and her majesty refused it? Yet did not we, nevertheless, receive the other? and agreeing to make a law thereof, did not her majesty in the end refuse all our travails? And did not the lord keeper, in her majesty's presence, in the beginning of the parliament, show this to be the occasion that we were called together? And did not her majesty in the end of the parliament, refuse all our travails? Is not this known to all here present, and to all the parliament house also? I beseech your honours discharge your consciences herein, and utter your knowledge simply as I do; for, in truth, herein did her majesty abuse her nobility and subjects, and did oppose herself against them by the way of advice.

COMMITTEE. Surely, we cannot deny it; you say the truth.

WANTWORTH. Then, I beseech your honours, show me if it were not a dangerous doing to her majesty in these two respects: first, in weakening, wounding, and discouraging the hearts of her majesty's loving and faithful subjects, thereby to make them the less able, or the more fearful and unwilling, to serve her majesty another time? On the other side, was it not a raising up and encouraging the hearts of her majesty's hateful enemies to adventure any desperate enterprise to her majesty's peril and danger.

COMMITTEE. We cannot deny but that it was very dangerous to her majesty in these respects.

WANTWORTH. Then, why do your honours ask, how I dare tell a truth, to give the queen warning to avoid her danger? I answer you thus: I do thank the Lord my God that I never found fear in myself to give the queen's majesty warning to avoid her danger; be you all afraid thereof, if you will, for I praise God I am not, and I hope never to live to see that day; and yet I will assure your honours, that twenty times and more, when I walked in my grounds, revolving this speech, to prepare against this day, my own fearful conceit did say unto me, that this speech would carry me to the place whither I shall now go, and fear would have moved me to put it out; when I weighed, whether in good conscience, and the duty of a faithful subject, I might keep myself out of prison and not warn my prince of walking in a dangerous course; my conscience said unto me, that I could not be a faithful subject if I had more respect to avoid my own danger than my prince's danger. Therewithal I was made bold, and went forward, as your honours heard; yet when I uttered those words in the house, and there was none without fault, no, not our noble queen, I paused, and beheld all your countenances, and saw plainly that those words did amaze you all; then I was afraid with you for company, and fear bade me to put out those words that followed, for your countenances

did assure me, that not one of you would stay me of my journey; yet the consideration of a good conscience, and of a faithful subject, did make me bold to utter it in such sort as your honours heard. With this heart and mind I spake it; and I praise God for it; and if it were to do again, I would with the same mind, speak it again.

COMMITTEE. Yea, but you might have uttered it in better terms: why did you not so?

WENTWORTH. Would you have me to have done as you of her majesty's council do, to utter a weighty matter in such terms as she should not have understood. To have made a fault then, it would have done her majesty no good, and my interest was to do her good.

COMMITTEE. You have answered us.

WENTWORTH. Then I praise God for it.

And he bowed.

MR. SECKFORD. Mr. Wentworth will never acknowledge himself to make a fault, nor say that he is sorry for anything he doth speak. You shall hear none of these things come out of his mouth.

WENTWORTH. Mr. Seckford, I will never acknowledge that to be a fault to love the queen's majesty while I live; neither will I be sorry for giving her majesty warning to avoid danger, while the breath is in my body. If you do think it a fault to love her majesty, or to be sorry that her majesty should have warning to avoid her danger, say so, for I cannot; speak for yourself, Mr. Seckford.—*Parl. Hist. i. 794—7.*

II.

Paper found in the hat of Felton, the murderer of the Duke of Buckingham.

The original writing still exists; and Mr. Lingard published it verbatim in his History. It is as follows:—

"That man is cowardly base, and deserveth not the name of a gentleman or Souldier that is not willinge to sacrifice his life for the honor of his God, his King, and his Countrie. Lett noe man commend me for doeinge of it, but rather discommend themselves as the cause of it; for if God had not taken ovr harts for ovr sinnes, he wd not have gone so long unpunished."

"JO. FELTON."

—Lingard's History of England, ix. 394.

III.

Character of Lord Strafford's Administration in Ireland.

The letter, from which the following extract is taken, addressed by Strafford to his intimate friend, sir Christopher Wandesford, master of the rolls

in Ireland, gives an account of the manner in which he had answered to the king and council the charges which had been brought against him :—

“ I then craved admission to justify myself in some particulars wherein I had been very undeservedly and bloodily traduced.

“ So I related to them all that had passed betwixt myself, earl of St. Albans, Wilmot, Mountnorris, Piers Crosby, and the jury of Galway, that hereupon touching and rubbing in the course of my decree upon their particulars, themselves and friends have endeavoured to possess the world I was a severe and an austere, hard-conditioned man—rather, indeed, a bashaw of Buda than the minister of a pious and Christian king. Howbeit, if I were not much mistaken in myself, it was quite the contrary; no man could show wherein I had expressed it in my nature, no friend I had would charge me with it in my private conversation, no creature had found it in the managing of my own private affairs, so as if I stood clear in all these respects, it was to be confessed by any equal mind, that it was not anything within, but the necessity of his majesty's service, which enforced me into a seeming strictness outwardly. And that was the reason, indeed; for where I found a Crown, a Church, and a people spoiled, I could not imagine to redeem them from under the pressure with gracious smiles and gentle looks; it would cost warmer water than so. True it was, that where a dominion was once gotten and sealed, it might be stayed and kept where it was by soft and moderate counsels; but where a sovereignty (be it spoken with reverence) was going down the hill, the nature of a man did so easily slide into the paths of an uncontrolled liberty, as it would not be brought back without strength, nor be forced up the hill again but by vigour and force. And true it was indeed, I knew no other rule to govern by, but by reward and punishment; and I must profess, that where I found a person well and entirely set for the service of my master, I should lay my hand under his foot, and add to his respect and power all I might; and that where I found the contrary; I should not dandle him in my arms, or soothe him in his untoward humour, but if he came in my reach, so far as honour and justice would warrant me, I must knock him soundly over the knuckles; but no sooner he become a new man, apply himself as he ought to the government, but I also change my temper, and express myself to him, as to that rather, by all the good offices I could do him. If this be sharpness, and this be severity, I desired to be better instructed by his majesty and their lordships, for, in truth, it did not seem so to me; however, if I were once told that his majesty liked not to be thus served, I would readily conform myself, and follow the bent and current of my own disposition, which is to be quiet, not to have debates and disputes with any.

“ Here his majesty interrupted me, and said, that was severity; wished me to go on in that way, for if I served him otherwise, I should not serve him as he expected from me.”—*Strafford's Letters and Despatches*, ii. 20

IV.

Fines imposed for the profit of the Crown from 1629 to 1640.

| | |
|---|------------------|
| 1. Richard Chambers, for having refused to pay custom duties not voted by parliament, fined | £2,000 |
| 2. Hillyard, for having sold saltpetre | 5,000 |
| 3. Goodenough, for the same cause | 1,000 |
| 4. Sir James Maleverer, for not having compounded with the king's commissioners for the title of knighthood | 2,000 |
| 5. The earl of Salisbury, for encroachments on the royal forests, | 20,000 |
| 6. The earl of Westmoreland, idem. | 19,000 |
| 7. Lord Newport, idem. | 3,000 |
| 8. Sir Christopher Hatton, idem. | 12,000 |
| 9. Sir Lewis Watson, idem. | 4,000 |
| 10. Sir Anthony Cooper, for having changed arable into grass land | 4,000 |
| 11. Alexander Leighton, for a libel | 10,000 |
| 12. Henry Sherfield for having broken some panes of stained glass in Salisbury Cathedral | 500 |
| 13. John Overman, and several other soap makers, for not having followed the king's orders in the fabrication and sale of soap, | 13,000 |
| 14. John Rea | 2,000 |
| 15. Peter Hern, and several others, for having exported gold | 8,100 |
| 16. Sir David Foulis and his son, for having spoken disrespectfully of the northern court | 5,500 |
| 17. Prynne, for a libel | 5,000 |
| 18. Buckner, censor, for having allowed Prynne's book to be published | 50 |
| 19. Michael Sparkes, printer, for having printed the said book | 500 |
| 20. Allison and Robins, for having spoken ill of archbishop Laud | 2,000 |
| 21. Bastwick, for a libel | 1,000 |
| 22. Prynne, Burton, and Bastwick, for libels | 15,000 |
| 23. Prynne's servant, for the same cause | 1,000 |
| 24. Bowyer, for having spoken against Laud | 3,000 |
| 25. Yeomans and Wright, for dying silks improperly | 5,000 |
| 26. Savage, Weldon, and Burton, for having spoken ill of lord Falkland, lord-lieutenant of Ireland | 3,500 |
| 27. Grenville, for speaking ill of the earl of Suffolk | 4,000 |
| 28. Favers, idem. | 1,000 |
| 29. Morley, for having abused and struck sir George Theobald, within the precinct of the court | 10,000 |
| 30. Williams, bishop of Lincoln, for having spoken ill of Laud | 10,000 |
| 31. Bernard, for having preached against the use of the crucifix | 1,000 |
| 32. Smart, for having preached against the ecclesiastical innovations of Dr. Cozens, &c. | 500 |
| | £ 173,650 |

This list is far from being complete; you may find a multitude of other cases, amounting to a considerable sum, in Rushworth, vols. i. and ii.

V.

Instructions sent by the King to the Marquis of Hamilton, for the holding of the Synod at Glasgow, in 1688.

"And as for this general assembly, though I can expect no good from it, yet I hope you may hinder much of the ill; first, by putting divisions among them, concerning the legality of their elections, then by protestations against their tumultuous proceedings."

And elsewhere:

"As for the opinions of the clergy to prorogue this assembly, I utterly dislike them, for I should more hurt my reputation by not keeping it, than their mad acts can prejudice my service; wherefore I command you hold your day: but, as you write, if you can break them by proving nullities in their proceedings, nothing better."—Burnet, *Memoirs of the Hamiltons*, (1677) 82, 88.

VI.

Composition of the Army raised by Parliament in 1642.¹

General-in-chief: Robert Devereux, earl of Essex.

Major-general, (or, as that office was then called, Serjeant major-general), sir John Merrick.

General of artillery: John Mordaunt, earl of Peterborough.²

Colonels of Infantry Regiments.

The earl of Essex.

The earl of Peterborough.

Henry Grey, earl of Stamford.

William Fiennes, viscount Say.

Edward Montague, viscount Mandeville.³

John Carey, viscount Rochford.⁴

Oliver St. John, viscount St. John.

Robert Greville, lord Brook.

John Roberts, lord Roberts.

Philip Wharton, lord Wharton.

John Hampden.

Denzil Holles.

Sir John Merrick.

Sir Henry Chomondley.

Sir William Constable.

Sir William Fairfax.⁵

Charles Essex.

Thomas Grantham.

Thomas Ballard.

William Bampfield.

¹ From a pamphlet published in London in 1642, and entitled, "The List of the Army raised under the command of his excellency Robert earl of Essex."

² On the death of the earl of Peterborough, sir John Merrick became general of the artillery, and Philip Skippon was appointed major-general.

³ Lord Manchester, known also by the name of baron Kimbolton.

⁴ Also called lord Hunsdon.

⁵ A cousin of the celebrated sir Thomas Fairfax.

Colonels of Troops of Horse.¹

| | |
|---|---------------------|
| The earl of Essex. | Anthony Mildmay. |
| The earl of Bedford. | Henry Mildmay. |
| The earl of Peterborough. | James Temple. |
| The earl of Stamford. | Thomas Temple. |
| Viscount Say. | Arthur Evelyn. |
| Viscount St. John. | Robert Vivers. |
| Basil Fielding, viscount Fielding. ² | Hercules Langrish. |
| Lord Brook. | William Pretty. |
| Lord Wharton. | William Pretty. |
| William Willoughby, lord Willoughby of Parham. | James Sheffield. |
| Ferdinand Hastings, lord Hastings. | John Gunter. |
| Thomas Grey, lord Grey of Groby, | Robert Burrell. |
| Sir William Balfour. | Francis Dowet. |
| Sir William Waller. | John Bird. |
| Sir Arthur Haslerig. | Matthew Drapper. |
| Sir Walter Earl. | Matthew Dimock. |
| Sir Faithful Fortescue. | Horace Carey. |
| Nathaniel Fiennes. | John Neal. |
| Francis Fiennes. | Edward Ayscough. |
| John Fiennes. | George Thompson. |
| Oliver Cromwell. | Francis Thompson. |
| Valentine Wharton. | Edward Keightly. |
| Henry Ireton. ³ | Alexander Douglas. |
| Arthur Goodwin. | Thomas Lidcot. |
| John Dalbier. | John Fleming. |
| Adrian Scrope. | Richard Grenville. |
| Thomas Hatcher. | Thomas Terril. |
| John Hotham. | John Hale. |
| Edward Berry. | William Balfour. |
| Sir Robert Pye. | George Austin. |
| Sir William Wray. | Edward Wingate. |
| Sir John Saunders. | Edward Baynton. |
| John Alured. | Charles Chichester. |
| Edwin Sandys. | Walter Long. |
| John Hammond. | Edmund West. |
| Thomas Hammond. | William Anselm. |
| Alexander Pym. | Robert Kirle. |
| | Simon Rudgeley. |

¹ In the writings of the period they are often called captains.

² Sometimes also called lord Newnham; he was son of the earl of Denbigh, and, on his death (April, 1643) assumed the title.

VII.

Employment of Catholics in the King's Armies.

So early as Sept. 23, 1642—that is to say, at the very moment of the breaking out of the civil war, and before the battle of Edgehill, the king wrote in the following terms to the earl of Newcastle:—

“Newcastle, this is to tell you that this rebellion has grown to that height, that I must not Locke what opinion men are who, at this tyme, are willing to serve me. Therefore, I do not only permit, but command you, to make use of all my loving subjects, without examining their consciences, (more than their loyalty to me,) as you shall finde most to conduce to the upholding of my just regal rights.”—Brodie, *Hist. of the British Empire*, iii. 489, *note*.

VIII.

Petition against Peace presented to the House of Commons, August 7, 1643, from the Common Council of London.

“SHOWETH that your petitioners, having heard that such propositions and offers have been lately sent from the house of peers to this honourable house, which (as we greatly fear), if yielded unto, would be destructive to our religion, laws, and liberties; and finding already, by experience, that the spirits of all the well-affected party in the city and counties adjacent, that are willing to assist the parliament, both in person and purse, are much dejected therat; and the brotherly assistance from Scotland, as well as the raising and maintaining of forces ourselves, thereby likely to be retarded (all which the petitioners refer to your serious consideration); and considering our present sad condition lies upon us in a special manner, through the incensed patience of the Almighty, by delay and want of execution of justice upon traitors and delinquents, and having an opportunity yet to speak, our desires are:

“That you would be pleased so to persist in your former resolutions, whereupon the people have so much depended, and wherein you have so deeply engaged yourselves (though you should perish in the work), that justice may be done upon offenders and delinquents. And that since we are as willing as ever to expose what we are and have for the crowning of so good a cause, you will be pleased, by speedy passing the ordinance hereto annexed, or one to this effect, to put us into a probable way for our and your defence, wherein your petitioners will, by the blessing of God, never be wanting.”

There was annexed to this petition the draught of an ordinance for empowering a committee to enlist men and receive subscriptions from such as should offer them.—Rushworth, ii. 3, 356.

IX.

*Petition in favour of Peace presented to the House of Commons,
August 9, 1643, by the Women of London.*

"Showeth that your poor petitioners (though of the weaker sex) do too sensibly perceive the ensuing desolation of this kingdom, unless by some timely means your honours provide for the speedy recovery hereof. Your honours are the physicians that can, by God's special and miraculous blessing (which we humbly implore), restore this languishing nation, and our bleeding sister, the kingdom of Ireland, which hath now almost breathed her last gasp.

"We need not dictate to your eagle-eyed judgment the way; our only desire is, that God's glory in the true reformed protestant religion may be preserved, the just prerogatives and privileges of king and parliament maintained, the true liberties and properties of the subjects, according to the known laws of the land, restored, and all honourable ways and means for, a speedy peace endeavoured.

"May it therefore please your honours, that some speedy course may be taken for the settlement of the true reformed protestant religion, for the glory of God and the renovation of trade, for the benefit of the subjects, they being the soul and body of the kingdom.

"And your petitioners, with many millions of afflicted souls, groaning under the burden of these times of distress, shall ever pray."

X.

4 Declaration and Vindication of John Pym, Esq.

"It is not unknown to all the world (especially to all the inhabitants in and about London) with what desperate and fame-wounding aspersions my reputation, and the integrity of my intentions to God, my king, and my country, hath been invaded by the malice and fury of malignants, and ill-affected persons to the good of the commonwealth. Some charging me with being a promoter and patronizer of all the innovations which have been obtruded upon the ecclesiastical government of the church of England. Others, of more spiteful and exorbitant spirits, alleging that I have been the man, who have begot and fostered all the so lamented distractions, which are now rife in the kingdom; and though such calumnies are ever more harmful to the authors, than to those whom they strive to wound with them, when they arrive only to the censure of judicious persons, who can distinguish forms, and see the difference betwixt truth and falsehood: yet, because the scandals inflicted upon my innocence have been obvious to people of all conditions, many of which may entertain a belief of those reproachful reports, though, in my own soul, I am far above those ignominies, and so was once resolved to have waved them, as unworthy of my notice: yet, at last, for the assertion of my integrity, I concluded to declare myself in this manner.

that all the world, but such as will not be convinced, either by reason or truth, may bear testimony of my innocency. To pass by, therefore, the earl of Strafford's business, in which some have been so impudent as to charge me of too much partiality and malice; I shall declare myself fully concerning the rest of their aspersions; namely, that I have promoted and fomented the differences now abounding in the English church.

"How unlikely this is and improbable, shall to every indifferent man be quickly rendered perspicuous: For that I am, and ever was, and so will die, a faithful son of the protestant religion, without having the least relation in my belief to those great errors of Anabaptism, Brownism, and the like, every man that hath any acquaintance with my conversation, can bear me righteous witness. These being but aspersions cast upon me by some of the discontented clergy, and their factors and abettors, because they might perhaps conceive that I had been a main instrument in extenuating the haughty power and ambitious pride of the bishops and prelates. As I only delivered my opinions as a member of the house of commons, that attempt or action of mine had been justifiable, both to God and a good conscience; and had no way concluded me guilty of a revolt from the orthodox doctrine of the church of England, because I sought a reformation of some gross abuses crept into the government by the cunning and perverseness of the bishops and their substitutes; for was it not high time to seek to regulate their power, when, instead of looking to the cure of men's souls (which is their genuine office), they inflicted punishment on men's bodies, banishing them to remote and desolate places; after stigmatizing their faces, only for the testimony of a good conscience, when, not contented with those insufferable insolences, they sought to bring in unheard of canons into the church, Arminian or papistical ceremonies (whether you please to term them, there is not much difference), imposing burdens upon men's consciences, which they were not able to bear, and introducing the old abolished superstition of bowing to the altar; and if it savoured either of Brownism or Anabaptism, to endeavour to suppress the growth of those Romish errors, I appeal to any equal minded protestant, either for my judge or witness; nay, had the attempts of the bishops desisted here, tolerable they had been, and their power not so much questioned, as since it hath; for when they saw the honourable high court of parliament began to look into their enormities and abuses, beholding how they wrested religion like a waxen nose, to the furtherance of their ambitious purposes, then Troy was taken in, then they began to despair of holding any longer their usurped authority; and therefore, as much as in them lay, both by public declarations and private councils, they laboured to foment the civil differences between his Majesty and his parliament, abetting the proceedings of the malignants with large supplies of men and money, and stirring up the people to tumults by their seditious sermons. Surely, then, no man can account me an ill son of the commonwealth, if I delivered my opinion, and passed my vote freely for their abolishment; which may by the same equity be put in practice by this parliament; as the dissolution of monasteries and their lazy inhabitants, monks and friars, was in Henry the Eighth's time; for without dispute, they carried as much reputation in the kingdom then, as bishops have done in it since; and yet a parliament then had power to put them down; why, then, should not a parliament have the power to do the like to these, every way guilty of as many offences against the state as the former? For my own

part, I attest God Almighty, the knower of all hearts, that neither envy, or any private grudge to all or any of the bishops, hath made me averse to their function, but merely my zeal to religion and God's cause, which I perceived to be trampled under foot by the too extended authority of the prelates; who, according to the purity of their institution, should have been men of upright hearts, and humble minds, shearing their flocks, and not slaying them, when it is evident they were the quite contrary.

"And whereas some will allege, it is no good argument to dissolve the function of bishops, because some bishops are vicious: to that answer, since the vice of these bishops was derivative from the authority of their function, it is very fitting the function, which is the cause thereof, be corrected, and its authority divested of its borrowed feathers; otherwise, it is impossible but the same power which made these present bishops (should the episcopal and prelatical dignity continue in its ancient height and vigour) so proud and arrogant, would infuse the same vices into their successors.

"But this is but a molehill to that mountain of scandalous reports that have been inflicted on my integrity to his sacred majesty; some boldly averring me for the author of the present distraction between his majesty and his parliament, when I take God, and all that know my proceedings, to be my vouchers, that I neither directly nor indirectly ever had a thought tending to the least disobedience or disloyalty to his majesty, whom I acknowledge my lawful King and sovereign, and would expend my blood as soon in his service as any subject he hath. 'Tis true, when I perceived my life aimed at, and heard myself proscribed a traitor, merely for my entireness of heart to the service of my country, was informed that I, with some other honourable and worthy members of parliament, were against the privileges thereof demanded, even in the parliament house, by his majesty, attended by a multitude of men at arms and malignants, who, I verily believe, had for some ill ends of their own persuaded his majesty to that excess of rigour against us; when, for my own part (my conscience is to me a thousand witnesses in that behalf), I never harboured a thought which tended to any disservice to his majesty, nor ever had an intention prejudicial to the state; when, I say, notwithstanding my own innocence, I saw myself in such apparent danger, no man will think me blameworthy in that I took care of my own safety, and fled for refuge to the protection of the parliament, which, making my case their own, not only purged me and the rest of the guilt of high treason, but also secured our lives from the storm that was ready to burst out upon us.

"And if this hath been the occasion that hath withdrawn his majesty from the parliament, surely the fault can in no way be imputed to me, or any proceeding of mine; which never went further, either since his majesty's departure nor before, than so far as they were warranted by the known laws of the land and authorized by the indisputable and undeniable power of the parliament; and so long as I am secure in my own conscience that this is truth, I account myself above all their calumnies and falsehoods, which shall return upon themselves, and not wound my reputation in good and impartial men's opinions.

"But in that devilish conspiracy of Cataline, against the state and senate of Rome, none among the senators was so obnoxious to the envy of the conspirators, or liable to their traduccements, as that orator and patriot of

his country, Cicero, because by his council and zeal to the commonwealth, their plot for the ruin thereof was discovered and prevented: though I will not be so arrogant to parallel myself with that worthy, yet my case (if we may compare lesser things with great), has to his a very near resemblance: the cause that I am so much maligned and reproached by ill-affected persons, being because I have been forward in advancing the affairs of the kingdom, and have been taken notice of for that forwardness, they, out of their malice, converting that to a vice which, without boast be it spoken, I esteem as my principal virtue, my care to the public utility. And since it is for that cause that I suffer these scandals, I shall endure them with patience, hoping that God in his great mercy will at last reconcile his majesty to his high court of parliament; and then I doubt not to give his royal self (though he be much incensed against me) a sufficient account of my integrity. In the interim, I hope the world will believe that I am not the first innocent man that hath been injured, and so will suspend their further censures of me."—Rushworth, ii. 3, 376.

XI.

Letter from the King to Prince Rupert, ordering him to go and relieve York.

Tickenhall (Tickenhall), 14 June, 1644.

"Nephew,

"First I must congratulate with you for your good successes, assuring you that the things themselves are no more welcome to me than that you are the means. I know the importance of supplying you with powder, for which I have taken all possible ways, having sent both to Ireland and Bristol. As from Oxford, this bearer is well satisfied that it is impossible to have at present, but if he tell you that I may spare them from hence, I leave you to judge, having but thirty-six left; but what I can get from Bristol, (of which there is not much certainty, it being threatened to be besieged) you shall have.

"But now I must give you the true state of my affairs, which if their condition be such as enforces me to give you more peremptory commands than I would willingly do, you must not take it ill. If York be lost, I shall esteem my crown little less, unless supported by your sudden march to me, and a miraculous conquest in the South, before the effects of the northern power can be found here: but if York be relieved, and you beat the rebels' armies of both kingdoms which are before it, then, but otherwise not, I may possibly make a shift (upon the defensive) to spin out time, until you come to assist me. Wherefore, I command and conjure you, by the duty and affection which I know you bear me, that (all new enterprises laid aside) you immediately march (according to your first intention) with all your force to the relief of York; but if that be either lost, or have freed themselves from the besiegers, or that for want of powder, you cannot undertake that work, that you immediately march with your whole strength to Worcester, to assist me and my army, without which, or your having relieved York, by beating the Scots, all the successes you can afterwards have, most infallibly

will be useless unto me; you may believe that nothing but an extreme necessity could make me write thus unto you, wherefore, in this case, I can no ways doubt of your punctual compliance with

Your loving uncle and most faithful friend,

"CHARLES R."

"I commanded this bearer to speak to you concerning Vavasour."—
Fvelyn, Mem., ii, Append. 87

XII.

The Self-denying Ordinance, adopted by the House of Commons, 3rd April, 1645.

"Be it ordained by the lords and commons assembled in parliament, that all and every of the members of either house of parliament shall be and by the authority of this ordinance are discharged at the end of forty days after the passing of this ordinance, of and from all and every office or command, military or civil, granted or conferred by both or either of the said houses of this present parliament, or by any authority derived from both or either of them, since the 20th November, 1640. And be it further ordained, that all governors and commanders of any island, town, castle, or fort, and all other colonels and officers inferior to colonels in the several armies, not being members of either of the said houses of parliament, shall, according to their respective commissions, continue in their several places and command wherein they were employed and entrusted, the 20th March, 1644, as if this ordinance had not been made. And that the vice-admiral, rear-admiral, and all other captains and other inferior officers in the fleet, shall, according to their several and respective commissions, continue in their several places and commands, wherein they were employed and entrusted, the said 20th March, 1644, as if this ordinance had not been made. Provided always, and it is further ordained and declared, that during this war the benefit of all offices, being neither military nor judicial, hereafter to be granted, or any way to be appointed to any person or persons, by both or either house of parliament, or by authority derived from thence, shall go and enure to such public uses as both houses of parliament shall appoint; and the grantees and persons executing all such offices shall be accountable to the parliament for all the profits and perquisites thereof, and shall have no profit out of any such office, other than a competent salary for the execution of the same, in such manner as both houses of parliament shall order and ordain. Provided, that this ordinance shall not extend to take away the power and authority of any lieutenant or deputy lieutenant in the several counties, cities, or places, or of any custos-rotulorum, or of any commissioner for justice of peace, or sewers, or any commission of Oyer and Terminer, or gaol delivery. Provided always, and it is hereby declared, that those members of either house who had offices by grant from his majesty before this parliament, and were by his majesty displaced sitting this parliament, and have since by authority of both houses been restored, shall not by this ordinance be discharged from their said offices or profits thereof, but shall enjoy the same; anything in this ordinance to the contrary thereof notwithstanding."—Parl. Hist. iii. 355.

XIII.

Extract from the Minutes of the Council held at Oxford, Dec. 5, 1644.

"PRESENT:

The King's Most Excellent Majesty,

Prince Rupert,
Prince Maurice,
Lord Keeper,
Lord Treasurer,
Lord Duke of Richmond,
Lord Marquis of Hertford,
Lord Great Chamberlain,
Earl of Southampton,
Lord Chamberlain,

Earl of Berkshire,
Earl of Sussex,
Earl of Chichester,
Lord Digby,
Lord Seymour,
Lord Colepepper,
Mr. Secretary Nicholas.
Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer."

"A letter was read, written by the earl of Essex to his highness prince Rupert, general of his majesty's armies, in these words:—

"Sir,

"There being a message sent from his majesty by the committees of both kingdoms, that were lately at Oxford, concerning a safe conduct for the duke of Richmond and earl of Southampton, without any direction, I am commanded, by both houses of parliament, to give your highness notice, that if the king be pleased to desire a safe conduct for the duke of Richmond and the earl of Southampton, with their attendants, from the lords and commons assembled in the parliament of England, at Westminster, to bring to the lords and commons assembled in the parliament of England, and the commissioners of the kingdom of Scotland, now at London, an answer to the propositions presented to his majesty for a safe and well-grounded peace, it shall be granted. This is all I have at present to trouble your highness, being

Your highness's humble servant,

"Dec. 8, 1644."

"Essex."

"This letter and the expressions therein being fully considered and debated, it was by the whole council unanimously resolved, that his majesty's desire of a safe conduct, in the terms expressed in that letter, would not be any acknowledgment or concession of the members of the two houses sitting at Westminster to be a parliament, nor any ways prejudice his majesty's cause.

"Whereupon his majesty declaring openly at the board, that since such was their lordships' opinion, that he did therefore and *eo animo* consent thereto, and accordingly his majesty desired his highness, prince Rupert, as his majesty's general, to return this answer:—

"My Lord,

"I am commanded by his majesty to desire of your lordship a safe conduct for the duke of Richmond and the earl of Southampton, with their

attendants, coaches and horses, and other accommodations for their journey in their coming to London, during their stay, and in their return, when they shall think fit, from the lords and commons assembled in the parliament of England, in Westminster, to bring to the lords and commons assembled in the parliament of England, and the commissioners of the parliament of Scotland, now at London, an answer to the propositions presented to his majesty for a safe and well-grounded peace. Resting,

'Oxon, 5 Dec., 1644.'

'Your lordship's servant,

'RUPERT.

"Which answer was accordingly sent to London by a trumpeter.

"EDW. NICHOLAS."

(The following is in the handwriting of sir Edward Nicholas.)

"Memorandum:—That the king and myself of all the council board were the only persons that concurred not in opinion that it was fit to call those sitting at Westminster a parliament. Prince Rupert, though he was present, did not vote, because he was to execute what should be resolved on by this council; but, by the order and practice of the council board, if the major part agree to any act or order, all the councillors that are present at the debate, albeit they dissent, are involved, and are to be named as if they consented.

Evelyn Mem. ii. Appendix, 90.

"E. N."

XIV.

March of David Lesley.

I.

March, march, pinks of election!

Why the devil don't you march onward in order?

March, march, dogs of redemption:

Ere the blue bonnets come over the border.

You shall preach, you shall pray,

You shall teach night and day;

You shall prevail e'er the kirk gone a whoring;

Dance in blood to the knees,

Blood of God's enemies!

The daughters of Scotland shall sing you to anoring.

II.

March, march, dregs of all wickedness!

Glory that lower you can't be debased;

March, march, dunghills of blessedness!

March and rejoice for you shall be raised

Not to board, not to rope,

But to faith and to hope;

Scotland's athirst for the truth to be taught her
 Her chosen virgin race,
 How they will grow in grace,
 Round as a neep, like calves for the slaughter!

III.

March, march, scourges of heresy!
 Down with the kirk and its whillieballeery!
 March, march! down with supremacy
 And the kist fu' o' whistles, that maks sic a cleary;
 Fife men and pipers braw,
 Merry deils, take them a',
 Gown, lace and livery, lickpot and ladle;
 Jockey shall wear the hood,
 Jenny the sark of God,
 For codpiece and petticoat, dishclout and daidle.

IV.

March, march, blest ragamuffins!
 Sing, as ye go, the hymns of rejoicing!
 March, march, justified ruffians!
 Chosen of heaven! to glory you're rising
 Ragged and treacherous,
 Lousy and lecherous,
 Objects of misery, scorning and laughter;
 Never, O happy race!
 Magnified so was grace;
 Host of the righteous! rush to the slaughter!

—Hogg, *Jacobite Relics of Scotland*, l. 5, 163.

XV.

I give here the unpublished documents and dispatches relative to the intervention of the States General of the United Provinces in favour of Charles I. The first of these is in French, the others are in Dutch; I have had them completely and literally translated from certified copies of the originals, which M. de Jouge, keeper of the records of the Netherlands, had transcribed, and sent to me from the Hague:

"I. *A Summary of what his Royal Highness the Prince of Wales caused to be represented on his part and in his presence to their High Mightinesses the States-General of the United Provinces of the Netherlands by the resident of the King of Great Britain, &c., Jan. 23, 1649.*"

"His royal highness the prince of Wales has for a long time had the intention of requesting a personal audience, to acknowledge the honours and great courtesies he has received from their lordships since his arrival in

these countries; and now he desires it with peculiar earnestness, on an occasion of the greatest importance in the world to his royal highness, and in which he presumes their lordships will fully sympathize. Their lordships cannot be ignorant of the great danger in which the life of the king, his father, now stands; how, after a personal treaty with his two houses of parliament, there was such progress made towards peace by the concessions of his majesty that the said houses declared themselves resolved to proceed on them to the establishment of the peace of the kingdom; which would indubitably have taken place had not the army seized his majesty's person, and committed to prison several members of parliament who had shown themselves the most disposed for the said treaty of peace.

"Such is, then, the state of that truly miserable kingdom; the king so closely confined that a gentleman, sent expressly by his royal highness only to see his majesty, was not admitted to his presence; the parliament so broken up and dispersed that there only remain there about fifty out of more than five hundred members in the house of commons; and the house of lords, who have unanimously refused their concurrence in these violent proceedings, practically annihilated, by a declaration of these few commons that all sovereign power in that kingdom belongs to them without king or lords. So that the members of parliament do not meet, except those who agree and submit to the orders of a court-martial, constituted to govern the kingdom; having to this end published a remonstrance containing the plan of a new government, which they desire to establish to the ruin of the parliament as well as of the king, subverting the fabric and constitution of the kingdom, and of all its laws, and exposing the protestant religion to the invasion of more heresies and schisms than ever in any century infested the Christian church.

"Not contented with this obfuscation, they have passed a resolution and appointed commissioners, for a trial against the person of his majesty, apparently to depose him and take away his life; which his royal highness cannot mention without horror, and which he is certain their lordships cannot hear without equal detestation.

"What influence these unprecedented proceedings may have on the interest and repose of all kings, princes, and states, and how much the extravagant power which these people have usurped may affect the tranquillity of the neighbouring countries, and how far the reformed religion may suffer by these scandalous acts of those who profess it, it is needless for his royal highness to urge their lordships to consider; but he contents himself with having given this sad recital of the condition and misery in which the king and the crown of England are at present; convinced that their lordships will act thereupon according to the esteem and respect they have ever shown towards so good a friend and ally. His royal highness therefore promises himself, from the friendship and wisdom of their lordships, as soon as possible, such assistance from their counsels and otherwise, as the present extreme necessity of the king his father and of his royal highness require, who by this will ever be really and for ever feel obliged to contribute all in their power to the support and advancement of the interest, grandeur, and felicity of their lordships."

After these representations of the prince of Wales, the States resolved to send to London, as extraordinary ambassadors, Messieurs Albert Joachim and Adrien de Pauw, with the following instructions :—

" II. Instructions for Messieurs the Ambassadors of their High Mightinesses sent to London in the year 1640.

" The ambassadors will represent to the parliament of England, that the consequences of the king's imprisonment will turn to the advantage or disadvantage of the kingdom of England, according to the moderation or severity that shall henceforth be shown towards his person; for all neutrals are of opinion that the misfortune in which he is at present, has come upon him because he was of a contrary opinion to that which has prevailed, as to the means to be employed to remedy the evils which exist in the kingdom of Great Britain. As it is yet time to find remedies for these evils, the parliament is requested not to tolerate that all sorts of pretexts should be seized upon to aggravate the grievances already charged upon the prisoner, and thus render him more unhappy than he is at present. Supposing that the party who has been defeated had gained the day, it is possible he might have judged with rigour the conduct of his adversaries, and refused them all means of defence; but the States-general are persuaded that the good faith of all those who shall hear the propositions of MM. the Ambassadors, will make them answer within themselves that this would not have been equitable, and that they will approve the axiom: *Politicum in civilibus dissensionibus, quamvis saepe per eas status ledatur, non tamen in exitium status contenditur, proinde qui in alterutras partes descendunt hostium vice non habendi.*

" MM. the States-general know that your excellencies have appointed commissioners extraordinary to examine the king's situation; they rely as much in the choice of your excellencies as in the sincerity and good faith with which the said commissioners will give, in the case in question, a judgment which may be submitted to the examination of the whole world, and be one day approved by the supreme Judge to whom they will be responsible. All well-disposed persons expect, that in an affair of such importance, a wise and Christian course will be pursued.

" The experience of all times has shown, that distrust easily introduces itself into governments; that in those which are composed of several bodies it is usually a powerful incitement; that, in short, there is neither shame nor dishonour to be feared, when the safety of the state is concerned, which renders all fees legitimate and commendable. Yet nothing can be more lamentable than to give way to extravagant suspicions, which interpret everything in an ill sense.

" If your excellencies have thought that some calamity threatened the kingdom of England, in preventing it you have attained your object. Every one knows that it happens to the wisest of those who govern the commonwealth, to mix up with public affairs somewhat of their private affections; and that never to fail in the management of great concerns, is a perfection above human nature, and the falling in which may well be excused.

" This is what the States-general beg your excellencies to take into consideration, persuaded that you will do it with the greatest wisdom. Notwithstanding the distrust your excellencies have conceived respecting so great a personage, you should take into account so long an imprisonment, (which, in itself, is already, according to the common law, a great punish-

ment,) and the great and notable services rendered to the kingdom of England by him and his predecessors, kings and queens. Your excellencies will have compassion upon him, and remember: *Ut eximatur periculo qui est inter vos celebris fama ne ipsis opprobria multi magis ac magis alienentur.*

"It is of great importance to the welfare of the kingdom of England, that your excellencies should proceed accordingly, and follow the counsel of that Roman who advised, the better to assure the measures of Pompey's consulship, not to annul anything that had been done under preceding governments, but only to be prudent for the time to come. One may with reason apply to the present circumstances, that excellent precaution which one took to secure his own statue, by preventing from being overthrown that of his enemy, whom he had completely subdued. It is thus your excellencies are requested to set in an affair of such high importance, which may be the source of so many troubles, and to show your goodness towards this great personage, in preserving him from shame and ignominy; for it is not sparing men to allow them to be dishonoured. The parliament is then, entreated to restore the king to liberty.

"The ambassadors are also, according to circumstances, *mutatis mutandis*, to lay the above considerations before general Fairfax and the council of the army, adding, that their distinguished merit has given them great authority in the kingdom of England, and that all these things depend principally on them, and will turn upon their intentions. On which account the States-general recommend this affair to their great wisdom, so that they may be to England, (whose greatest hopes are now placed in them), not only a shield and a sword in time of war, but also a help to the king in his unhappy situation, by directing public discussions towards a good and moderate end, by which the kingdom will profit, and which will bring on themselves an immortal glory. By their magnanimity, they will cause most of their fellow-citizens to shed tears of joy, who are at this moment on the point of weeping with sorrow. Of old, it was said that the Syracusans were but the body and the limbs; and that Archimedes was the soul which gave motion to all; the same thing may be said at present, with far more reason, of the kingdom of England, and of his excellency and the council of the army: this body and these limbs will not act, in the present affair, under any other direction than that which his excellency and the council of the army shall give them according to their wise reflections. While thus setting forth their own eminent qualities in fresh glory and grandeur, the benefit will be felt by every inhabitant of the kingdom. The ambassadors will moreover add, that there was a great captain and wise statesman who gloried in having never caused any one of his countrymen to shed a tear, regarding as the sweetest fruit of his victories that he could every day dare to meet all his fellow-citizens, following the proverb: "That clemency makes beloved and revered, all those who practise it, and that severity, far from removing obstacles and difficulties, usually augments and multiplies them.

"Prudent physicians, also, fear to employ too powerful remedies, because these often drive the disease and the life from the body at the same time, and for the greater safety's sake, they prefer the use of gentler means.

"If his excellency and the council of the army act thus, the hearts of the well-disposed subjects of England will unite in reciprocal friendship, better

and more powerful to consolidate a state than the heaviest chains of iron.

"The States-general think that the kingdom of England will be invincible; if his excellency, as well as the council of the army, will proceed on foundations so equitable to the world and so agreeable to God, and which are besides so conformable to the character of the English nation, and to the situation of its affairs. Finally, the States-general entreat his excellency and the council of the army to embrace and employ the said means, so that the king may be enlarged from his prison and restored to liberty."

III. *First Despatch from Messieurs the Ambassadors-Extraordinary in England to the States-General.*

"High and mighty Lords:

"On arriving here on the 6th* instant, towards evening, we were received by the master of the ceremonies of parliament with many excuses, and we immediately requested and insisted upon an audience for the next day. On the 6th, early in the morning, we requested, through our secretaries and the master of the ceremonies, to be presented to both houses of parliament. In reply, the speaker of the upper house sent word to us, that the said house had adjourned to Monday, and the speaker of the house of commons intimated that, notwithstanding some particular obstacles, he would present our request, and endeavour to obtain assent to it. Our secretaries having waited for the answer, the speaker let us know in the afternoon that the house had not been able to sit in the morning, because all the judges, who form part of it, had had to attend the high court of justice, and that for this reason the lower house also had been obliged to adjourn to Monday next. Learning afterwards, that on the same day the said court of justice had pronounced sentence of death against the king, in his own presence, we succeeded, on Sunday the 7th instant (although all occupations that do not relate to religious worship are set aside on this day), after much trouble, in obtaining in the morning, first, a private audience of the speaker of the lower house, then, one of that of the upper house; and, at last, in the afternoon (but not without great difficulty), we were admitted to the presence of general Fairfax, Lieutenant-general Cromwell, and the principal officers of the army, who were at the same time assembled at the general's house. We made all possible representations to the said speakers, general, and lieutenant-general, as well in private as when assembled together; we supported our solicitations with the most powerful arguments we could devise, to obtain a reprieve of the king's execution, (which, it was said, was fixed for Monday,) until we should have been heard by the parliament; but we only received different answers, dictated by the disposition or the temper of each of them.

"On Monday the 8th, early in the morning, we sent again to the speakers of both houses, to urge them to obtain an audience for us; and after our secretaries, together with the master of the ceremonies, had been kept waiting at Westminster till the afternoon, we were all at once informed, scarcely ten minutes before the time, that the two houses would receive us before they went to dinner, and that we were to go at two o'clock to the upper house, and at three to the house of commons. We acted according to this in-

New style.

timation, and went to the upper house, where there were very few peers, as well as to the house of commons, where sat about eighty members. After having verbally stated and delivered in writing the substance of our instructions, tending principally to have the king's execution postponed until we should, in a second audience, or in conferences, have had opportunities to state more powerful grounds to induce them to grant him his life, or at least not to proceed precipitately to execute the sentence of death, we were answered by the two speakers that our proposal should be taken into consideration.

"The members of the upper house voted, that conferences on this subject, between the two houses should immediately take place; but as the day was already far advanced, and as the members of the house of commons, as soon as our audience was over, rose to depart, even before we had left the ante-room, into which we had been conducted on our way out, we with all speed had our proposal translated into English, and delivered to the speaker of the lower house, and afterwards to the speaker of the upper house.

"Yet, having seen yesterday, as we passed by Whitehall, that preparations were making, which were said to be for the execution, and having conferred for a long time this morning with the commissioners of the crown of Scotland, to save, if possible, the king's life, we still continued to request of parliament, through our secretaries, either an answer or another audience; and endeavoured, by the intervention of the Scottish commissioners, to speak once more to the general, and met him about noon at his secretary's house, at Whitehall. The general was at length touched by our animated and pressing entreaties, and declared that he would go directly to Westminster, and recommend to parliament to grant the answer and the reprieve we requested, and that he would take a few officers of note with him to support the application.

"But we found, in front of the house in which we had just spoken with the general, about two hundred horsemen; and we learned, as well on our way as on reaching home, that all the streets, passages, and squares of London were occupied by troops, so that no one could pass, and that the approaches of the city were covered with cavalry, so as to prevent any one from coming in or going out. We could not, and we knew not in consequence, what further to do. Two days before, as well previous to as after our audience, we had by trustworthy persons been assured that no proceeding or intercession in the world could succeed, and that God alone could prevent the execution resolved upon; and so the Scottish commissioners, with great pains, had also told us. And so it proved; for, the same day, between two and three o'clock, the king was taken to a scaffold covered with black, erected before Whitehall. His majesty, accompanied by the bishop of London who, it is said, had that morning, at six o'clock, administered to him the holy sacrament and consolations of religion, after having said a few words, gave up the garter, the blue riband and his cloak, took his coat off himself and showed a great deal of firmness in all his conduct. The king, having, laid himself down, his head was cut off, and held up to the gaze of the assembled crowd.

"This is what, to our great regret, we are obliged to announce to your high mightinesses; and we declare that we have employed all possible diligence, without intermission and with all our power, to acquit ourselves of your high mightinesses' commission, in seeking to prevent the execution.

of this 40 fatal sentence. Meantime, as in this country all kinds of reports are put forth, for and against, according to every one's fancy, and as they are often misinterpreted and embellished or exaggerated, particularly now all minds are so excited, we pray your high mightinesses, in case you should receive reports contrary to or more alarming than the present, to place no faith in them; and to believe us, who came hither at the peril of our lives, and have neglected none of the duties with which we were charged.

"We dare not send your high mightinesses the further particulars that we learn in many quarters, confidential or public, on this event, as the passage is very difficult, all the sea-ports being closed. We will only add that it is said the king, on the scaffold, recommended that religion should be strengthened by taking the advice of Roman-catholic divines, and that the rights of the prince his son should be respected; adding, that he thought himself in conscience innocent of the blood which had been shed, except of that of the earl of Strafford. Immediately after the king's death, it was announced and proclaimed throughout the city by sound of trumpet.

"We beg the Almighty to grant a long prosperity to your high mightinesses, and to your high and mighty government.

Signed,

"ALB. JOACHIM

"London, February 9th; 1649."

IV. *Second Despatch.*

"High and Mighty Lords;

"By our first dispatch of the 9th instant, we minutely informed your high mightinesses of all the proceedings we had taken with the principal functionaries and other eminent personages in this country, as well as of the solicitations we addressed to them, and the proposals we transmitted publicly and in writing to the two houses of parliament (of which we herein insert a copy, not having had time to append it to our preceding despatch, which was sent by an unexpected opportunity), proposals which were left unanswered, as was our request to be admitted to a second audience, and which were followed by the immediate execution of the king, and the prohibition to any one whomsoever, under pain of high treason, to take upon himself any authority in the name of monarchical power, or to acknowledge and favour the government of the prince of Wales, or any other pretender to the royal succession.

"Already, before this event, we apprehended, and our fears have since been realized, that it had been resolved among the authorities here to abolish entirely the monarchical government, and to establish one of a quite different nature; for it is publicly said here that the descendants of the late king will be, without any exception, excluded for ever from any sovereignty in this country, though it is not ascertained what sort of government is to replace that which is abolished.

"We have also just heard that already commissioners are appointed by parliament to go with all speed to Scotland, where they presume and announce being able to direct affairs according to the system adopted in England. It is also said, publicly as well as in private, that the members of the upper house show themselves displeased at the king's execution, and do not at all agree with the house of commons on the changes to be introduced in the government; on the other hand, it is thought that Scotland wishes to remain faithful to

monarchical government, and to its old institutions. It is difficult to foresee what will be the issue of all these combinations and changes in the two countries; and though public tranquillity is nowise disturbed in this capital, in consequence of the strict watch kept by the numerous military posts, we are ignorant what, in this respect, is the situation of the provinces.

"Yesterday, we received a visit from the lieutenant-general Cromwell, who spoke to us with infinite respect of the government of your high mightinesses; among other subjects, he introduced that of religion, giving us to understand that, with the concurrence of your high mightinesses, it would be as possible as necessary to re-establish it here upon a better system, and to give it a better organization.

"The earl of Denbigh, who came also yesterday to see us, spoke at great length on different questions relating to the government, past and to come; whence we concluded that there are still many affairs to arrange, and that the measures they purpose to take do not afford any probable conjecture as to their issue and success. As the unhappy event of the king's execution puts an end to the negotiation with which our extraordinary embassy was charged, we will jointly use our endeavours that the affairs of our mission may suffer as little as possible, and may continue to be treated according to the interests and to the entire satisfaction of your high mightinesses.

"The high court of justice having terminated its functions, other extraordinary tribunals have been instituted, to try the peers and other illustrious state prisoners, such as the duke of Hamilton, the earl of Holland, lord Goring, &c. Those of a lower rank will be tried by the ordinary tribunals, and the prisoners of war by a court-martial.

"Among other matters that are at present treated of in parliament, it is proposed that our people should enjoy here all the rights of navigation, commerce, manufacture, trades, and market, equally and in common with the English nation. We were not ignorant of these dispositions, and moreover were given to understand that they would be disposed to make more full and minute proposals to us on this subject. We think we hereby give your high mightinesses an evident proof that people here are occupying themselves with questions quite out of the ordinary track of affairs.

"We implore the Almighty to keep in long prosperity the government of your high mightinesses.

Signed,

"ALB. JOACHIM,

"A. PAUW

"London, February 12th, 1649."

V. *Third Despatch.*

"High and Mighty Lords:

"After the bloody catastrophe which put an end to the king's life, an event of which our despatches of the 9th and 12th instant informed your high mightinesses, we resolved to keep within our lodgings, after the example of other ambassadors, and of the Scottish commissioners. The French ambassador and the Scottish commissioners, however, having paid us a visit before this event, and the Spanish ambassador having repeatedly done us the same honour before and after, we could do no otherwise than return these acts of kindness: we accordingly acquitted ourselves of this duty on the 13th,

and we remarked that their excellencies were deeply affected by this great event, though the French ambassador had assured us beforehand of his perfect knowledge of the events which would take place.

"The ambassador of Spain, Don Alfonso de Cardenas, told us that the day after this fatal event he had received orders from the king his master to intervene in the affairs of this country; but at present he is of opinion, as well as the French ambassador, that by the unexpected death of the king of England, their diplomatic functions and character having ceased, they cannot act any longer in their high office, nor interfere in any respect until they have received fresh orders from their court. The Scottish commissioners have sent two despatches to their constituents, that is, to the Scottish parliament at present assembled; they expect an answer to their first despatch in the course of the week, and will not act till they are duly authorized.

"The general opinion is that the government will undergo an entire change; that the royal family will be set aside, and another form of government introduced; that perhaps they will imitate that of the commonwealth of Venice, of the United Provinces, or some other republican government." We are informed that, in fact, nine members of the house of peers and eighteen of that of the house of commons are to meet in commission to draw up conjointly the basis of a fresh constitution. The 13th of this month was the day appointed for the meeting of the king's judges, in a court of justice at Westminster-hall; but we have just been informed that the meeting did not take place, the judges having alleged that they were not sufficiently qualified for this, their functions having expired at the king's death, and that they cannot resolve to accept so suddenly their new nominations made by parliament, nor change the title of their acts of procedure and other necessary formalities, such as those adopted by parliament. On the 20th of January, 1648, and which we transmitted to your high mightinesses by our despatch of the 9th instant. We continue in the most complete uncertainty as to the issue of the events which, from the diversity of opinions and other fortuitous occurrences, may still undergo vicissitudes that it is impossible to submit to any probable conjecture; we shall therefore merely remark, that hitherto public tranquillity has not been in any way disturbed; and we pray your high mightinesses to attach no other value to our information than that which may be merited by our efforts to discover truth in this maze of true and false reports which we receive on all sides, and which only leave us the satisfaction of confidentially informing your high mightinesses of what we have been able to collect in our zeal for your service.

Signed,

"ADRIEN PAUW,

"ALB. JOACHIM

"London, February 15th, 1649."

VI. *Fourth Dispatch*

"High and Mighty Lords:

"The information contained in our last dispatch, of the 15th of this month, having appeared sufficiently important to us, we took care to forward it to your high mightinesses by a safe and speedy opportunity; yet the wind having since that time been very contrary, we fear it did not reach its

destination so speedily as we had hoped. Since that, we have witnessed events of still greater importance. On the 16th of this month, the house of commons, notwithstanding the expectation and the wish of the commissioners of both houses, sitting in committee, and which requested to be consulted on all the measures to be taken, decreed that the house of lords should from that period cease its functions, and be no longer consulted or looked upon as a deliberative body, or as constituting an authority in anything concerning the affairs of the kingdom; so that, notwithstanding that the lords and princes still retain their titles and dignities, and are qualified to occupy any office whatever, there will in future be only one sole house of commons as the English parliament; and the peers will no longer be admitted in it but as deputies elected by the counties. Next day, the 17th, the house of commons by a decree abolished for ever the office of king in England. We are informed, moreover, that the parliament thus reduced to one house of commons alone, will meet once every two years for a limited time; and that permanent executive power will be vested in a council of thirty or forty members, of whom about twelve may be peers. The council thus organized will represent, during the recess of parliament, the sovereign power of the kingdom. This last measure is not, however, so definitively resolved as the two above-mentioned. The house of commons is becoming by degrees complete by the return of several members who resume their seats on signing an expurgatory act, by which they declare that they renounce the opinions which heretofore placed them in opposition to their colleagues. It is also said that at an early day new judges for the higher courts will be elected, and new justices of peace.

"The earl of Denbigh, speaker of the house of lords, not having been able to send us a message on the 17th, came to pay us a visit on the 18th, to inform us in what manner had been carried into effect the dissolution of this assembly, and to deliver the last commands he had received from their lordships, in transmitting to us their answer to our proposals. After having read them to us, he gave us the copy, which we enclose in the present dispatch, retaining himself the original manuscript as his personal quittance, adding, that it was, at the same time, the last deliberative act of the upper house, which had not wished to dissolve until it had given this mark of respect to your high mightinesses.

"The house of commons also sent to ask us, by its own messenger, when it would suit us to present ourselves to them to receive their answer to our proposals. To which we replied, that as soon as the house would acquaint us with the time appointed for this audience, we would attend.

"Since the unhappy event of the king's death, we had not insisted upon an answer; and though we had heard no more about it, we learn at this moment that an outline of this answer has been published in the Gazette, without any official communication of it having been sent us. A report had previously been spread, and even printed, that we had requested that our proposals should not be made public. Nothing can be more false than this assertion; without having in any way interfered in the matter, or having even mentioned a word on the subject, we left it entirely to the discretion of the two houses, to each of which our proposals were separately addressed in writing, with the necessary form. We have remarked, besides, that the reply made by us to the speaker of the house of commons when our proposals were delivered, has not been inserted in the Gazette in its real tenour,

and it has been hitherto impossible for us to discover whether such publications appear with or without the sanction of the superior authorities.

"On the 16th of this month, some troops of infantry and cavalry marched hence to Bristol; and there is a report that in that town, as well as at Gloucester, some indignation has been expressed against the proceedings of parliament. Here, however, and in the neighbourhood, all is quiet.

"To-day, being the day appointed for the appearance of the impeached lords, before the newly-created high court at Westminster-hall, Goring, Capel, Hamilton, Holland, and sir John Owen, these lords, with the exception of the earl of Holland, who is ill, appeared before that court, and after having heard each in his turn, the charges brought against him, and given in answers to them, were sent back to prison to await another summons for the continuation of their trial.

Signed,

"ADRIEN PAUW;

"ALB. JOACHIM.

VII. Fifth Dispatch.

"High and Mighty Lords:

"The commissioners of the kingdom of Scotland, having received dispatches from their parliament, sent word of their contents to us last evening at a somewhat irregular hour, and forwarded to us the proclamation, the decree, and the letter, copies of which accompany this dispatch. Your high mightinesses will learn by their contents, that the prince of Wales has just been proclaimed by the Scottish parliament, king of Great Britain, France, and Ireland. The commissioners besides informed us, that a gentleman had been immediately sent abroad with copies of these decrees; that the proclamation of them had been made in every direction, and that they were preparing forthwith to send an envoy, furnished with the largest instructions to his majesty. It is rumoured here, that the parliament is much displeased at this measure; and particularly because the Scots did not content themselves with proclaiming him king of Scotland only, but had added to his titles "king of Great Britain and Ireland." Levies of troops are going on here in secret, and are constantly dispatched towards Scotland and other places, which makes it to be presumed that in the latter engagements many men were killed. The capital yet continues to enjoy perfect tranquillity, and exhibits no appearance of sedition; the complements of the men-of-war are being made up one after another, and we should not be surprised if in a very short time there were nearly thirty vessels perfectly equipped and ready for sea; this number, it is confidently said, will hereafter be increased to seventy, and it is added that three commissioners of parliament will take the command or superintendence of this fleet; as to that, there seems no longer any mention made of the earl of Warwick as commander. Last Monday, the 22nd instant, the gentleman-usher came to inform us that on the Wednesday or Thursday following, we should be requested to go to parliament to receive, before the whole house, an answer to our proposals. On Wednesday he informed us that the audience would take place on Thursday evening; and accordingly on that day we were conducted in state to Westminster-hall. Having been immediately introduced into the house of commons, we sat down on the chairs placed for us, and the speaker having read to us the answer of the house, gave us a copy of it. Whereupon, we

answered, in a few words, that when we had read it, we would ourselves transmit it to our government, whom it was our intention, with the least possible delay, to rejoin, and that we availed ourselves of the present opportunity to take leave of parliament in our quality of ambassadors-extraordinary. The house that day was much fuller than at our first audience, on account of the return of several of their absent members, and the restoration of many dissentient members who had successively come to resume their seats under the expurgatory act. The nomination of a greater number of members has been one of the first cares of the new house; after which they proceeded to elect the thirty-eight members of whom the state-council of the kingdom is to be composed, and whose names and qualities your high mightinesses will read in the enclosed Gazette. The judges of the kingdom also resumed their sittings last week, and held their usual term.

"The day before our last audience, and consequently after the notification we had received of it, we received the letters of your high mightinesses of the 22nd instant; and having already made preparations for our departure, we shall effect it as soon as possible, wishing to return as soon as we can to your high mightinesses, to communicate the answer we have received, and render a detailed account of our mission, which has been accompanied and followed by a multitude of incidents and circumstances, which in the present precarious state of affairs, we do not think proper to trust to paper. Contrary winds and severe frosts having impeded the navigation of the Thames, we cannot fix the day of our departure; but we will seize the first opportunity to return, either directly or by way of Dover and Calais, notwithstanding the inconveniences which this last passage is said to present.

"The state prisoners, viz. the duke of Hamilton, lord Goring, lord Capel, and sir John Owen, have already appeared several times before the high court of justice. The first put in a bill of exceptions, but it was rejected, and he was ordered to prepare his defence, and counsel were assigned to him; the three others have confined themselves within the terms of their defence, particularly lord Capel, against whom, as to the capitulation and the quarter granted, general Fairfax and commissary-general Ireton were heard as witnesses, appearing for this specially before the court. All these circumstances make one entertain fears as to the fate of these noble personages, who are considered to be in imminent danger. We think it proper to inform your high mightinesses, that the present is the sixth dispatch we have sent you, the two preceding ones being of the 15th, and 19th instant; the delays occasioned by contrary winds and the frost give us reason to fear that all may not have reached your high mightinesses.

Signed,

"ADRIAN PAUW,

"ALB. JOACHIM.

"London, February 26th, 1649."

INDEX.

Abbott, Geo., Archbp. of Canterbury, suspended, 19.

Absolution, its position on the Continent at the accession of Charles I., 2; its position in England at and preceding the same period, 3, 4, 5; its position in England under Strafford, 43; attempts made by the king to extend it, 47; its powerlessness in 1641, 88.

Agitators, or delegates, appointed by the common soldiers of the army to represent their views, 321; draw up "the case of the army," 354.

"**Agreement of the people,**" a plan for a republic drawn up by Ireton, 411.

Alford, Mr., his speech on the amended bill of rights, 26.

Ambassadors of England insulted in foreign courts, 44.

Annandale, Earl of, declares for the king, 233.

Antrim, Earl of, arrested by the parliamentary forces in Ireland, and discovery of his plot against the parliament, 219.

Arbitrary tribunals abolished, 110.

Argyle, Earl of, embraces the cause of the covenant, 78; retires to Kinnell Castle to avoid being arrested by the king, 113; explanation of the affair, 114; is created duke of Argyle, *ib.*; arrives in London to co-operate with the independents, 266; characterized, *ib.*; concludes a treaty with the Scottish royalists, 399.

Aristocracy, its condition on the Continent at the accession of Charles I., 2; its condition in England at and preceding the same period, 3; courted by the king in his difficulties, 48; a portion of it sides with the people, 49; takes alarm at the progress of the church, 85.

Army, parliamentary, formation of, decreed, 160; marches from London to attack the king, 163; reviewed on

Turnham-green, 170; another army raised for parliament, 193; reviewed on Hounslow-heath by Essex, 199; its composition in 1644, 230; capitulates to that of the king in Cornwall, 242; characterized, 292; petitions parliament, 318; several of its officers summoned to the bar of the house of commons, 319; demands the restoration of Cromwell to command, 320; petitions parliament for redress, *ib.*; its increasing power, 321; opens communications with the king, 322; several regiments mutiny, 323; under the direction of Cromwell, marches towards London, 331; draws up a *humble remonstrance* to parliament, *ib.*; demands the expulsion of Holles and other members, *ib.*; its conciliatory treatment of the king, 334; makes proposals to the king, 337; marches towards London, 339; coolness between it and the king, 341; reviewed on Hounslow Heath, 343; marches upon London, *ib.*; societies formed in, against the king and Cromwell and other officers, who appeared to favour him, 351; appoints *new agents* to support its particular views, 352; its demands in Nov. 1647, 355; meeting of a portion of, at Ware, 364; meeting of the officers and agitators at headquarters, 367; marches through London, 374; is quartered in various parts of London, 375; petition from, calling for the punishment of the king, 400; is put in motion against the presbyterians, 408; its violent proceedings against the presbyterian members of parliament, 410.

Arnell, Richard, shot for mutiny, 365.

Arundel, Earl of, released from the Tower on demand of the lords, 17; again arrested by the king, 18.

Ashburnham, Mr., accompanies the king in his flight from Oxford, 300; charac-

- terized, 336; his insolent demeanour towards the parliamentary officers, 340; accompanies the king in his flight from Hampton Court, 359; his preliminary interview with Hammond, 360; is ordered to quit the Isle of Wight, 371.
- Astley, Lord, defeated at Stow by the parliamentary forces, 297.
- Atherton Moor, battle of, 190.
- Aubigny, Lady, her connexion with Waller's plot, 186.
- Axtell, Col., his violent conduct at the king's trial, 423 *et seq.*
- BALFOUR, Sir Wm., tampered with by the king, 104; dismissed from the government of the Tower, 127.
- Bampton Bush, battle of, 270.
- Bancroft, Bp. of Oxford, his death, 88.
- Bancroft, Dr., maintains the supremacy of the church, 49; is created Arch-bishop of Canterbury, 50.
- Barbary pirates, make descents on the English and Irish coasts, 44.
- Barnstaple surrenders to the royal troops, 191.
- Base money, coining of, proposed by the king's government, 81.
- Basing-House, taken by the parliamentary forces, 290.
- Bastwick, John, brought before the star-chamber, 63; his trial, *ib.*; his sentence, 64; its execution, *ib.*; his condemnation voted illegal by the house of commons, 92; his triumphant return to London, 93.
- Bath, surrenders to the royal troops, 191 taken by the parliamentary forces, 290.
- Batten, Admiral, cannonades Burlington, 176.
- Bedford, Earl of, his death, 104.
- Bellasis, Sir H., imprisoned by the king for his liberty of speech, 81.
- Bellievre, M. de, urges the king to accept the propositions of parliament, 308.
- Benyon, Geo., addresses a petition to parliament on behalf of the king, 149.
- Berkley, Sir John, characterized, 336; joins the king by order of Henrietta-Maria, *ib.*; his interview with Cromwell and other leaders of the army, at Reading, *ib.*; his first interview with the king, 357; his negotiations with the army, *ib.*; accompanies the king in his flight from Hampton Court, 359; his preliminary interview with Hammond, 360; waits on Fairfax and the other generals at Windsor, 367; his interview with Commandant Watson, *ib.*; is ordered to guard the Isle of Wight, 371.
- Berwick, taken by Langdale, 381.
- Birch, Col., arrested by Col. Pride, 409.
- Bishoprics and deaneries, bill for abrogating them introduced into the house of commons, 95.
- Bishops, bill for excluding them from parliament passed by the commons, 95; rejected by the lords, *ib.*; further proceedings respecting the measure, 126; some of them draw up a protest declaring null and void all proceedings in parliament during their absence from it, 127; are impeached and sent to the Tower, 128.
- Blake, Col., his reception of the parliamentary commissioners at Wallingford, 250.
- Blechington, taken by Cromwell, 276.
- Bond, Denis, his speech in favour of republicanism, 309.
- Bradshaw, John, characterized, 416; chosen president of the high court of commission, *ib.*; his altercations with the king, *ib. et seq.*
- Bray, Captain, deprived of his command for mutiny, 365; restored to his command, 367.
- Brentford, battle of, 169.
- Brereton, Sir Wm., continued in his command by parliament, notwithstanding the self-denying ordinance, 271.
- Bridgewater surrenders to the royal troops, 191; taken by the parliamentary forces, 290.
- Bristol surrenders to the royal troops, 191; surrenders to the parliamentary forces, 284.
- Bristol, Earl of, not summoned by Charles to his second parliament, 14; appeals to the peers and has his claim admitted, 16; is impeached by the king, *ib.*; impeaches Buckingham, *ib.*; is arrested by the king, 18.
- Brownists, sect of, their rise, 60; their emigrations, *ib.*
- Brook, Lord, his speech at Guildhall, 168.
- Buckingham, Villiers, Duke of, his visit to Madrid with Prince Charles, 4; impeached by the commons, 15; characterized, *ib.*; his answer to the

charges against him, 16; impeached by Lord Bristol, *ib.*; fails in his attempt upon the Isle of Ré, 30; difficulties of his position, 21; his speech on the occasion of a subsidy being voted, 22; assassinated, 30.

Buckingham, Duke of, takes up arms in support of the king, 381.

Burleigh, Lord, his advice to Queen Elizabeth, 21.

Burley, Capt., hanged at Newport for a movement in favour of the king, 373.

Burton, Wm., brought before the star-chamber, 62; his trial, *ib.*; his sentence, 64; its execution, *ib.*; his condemnation voted illegal by the house of commons, 92; the public honour paid him on his return to London, 93.

Burlington cannonaded by Admiral Batten, 176.

Byron, Sir Gilbert, raises troops for the king, in Nottinghamshire, 331.

Byron, Sir John, appointed governor of the Tower, 129.

CADIZ, expedition against, dispatched by the king, 14; its failure, *ib.*

Caernarvon, Lord, his death and character, 204.

Cambridge university, sends part of its plate to the king, 147.

Canterbury, royalist disturbances at, 376.

Capel, Lord, appointed to attend Prince Charles into the west of England, 269; raises troops for the king in Hertfordshire, 331.

Carew, Mr., sent to the Tower by the king, 81.

Carew, Sir Alexander, his trial and execution, 259.

Carlisle, taken by the Scots, 231; taken by the royalist troops, 331.

"Case of the army," a declaration drawn up by the discontented troops, 354.

Catholics, Roman, join the army of Newcastle, 176.

Catholicism, its progress under Laud, 53.

Censorship of a religious character established, 353.

Challoner, Mr., executed for a plot against the parliament, 123.

Charles I., his accession to the throne of England, 1; assembling a parliament, *ib.*; his personal character, 2; the circumstances which placed him in antagonism with his people, *ib.*; his

visit to Spain previous to his accession, 4; his reception at Madrid, *ib.*; his marriage with Henrietta Maria, *ib.*; influence of the union upon his mind, 5; his position with regard to parliament on his accession to the throne, 11; his resentment of the freedom of speech indulged in by the house of commons, 12; demands subsidies, engaging to redress real grievances, *ib.*; indignant at the refusal of subsidies, dissolves parliament, 13; his position with reference to his people at this juncture, *ib.*; intimates his intention to govern by himself, *ib.*; orders a loan to be raised, *ib.*; directs severe measures against the Roman catholics, 14, but tells them dispensations and pardons, *ib.*; calls a second parliament, *ib.*; the character of his despotism at this period, *ib.*; takes measures for keeping the more popular orators out of parliament, *ib.*; his speech to the commons on the occasion of Buckingham's impeachment, 18; forbids the judges to answer the questions put by the lords, in the Earl of Bristol's case, 17; sends Sir Dudley Digges and Sir John Eliot to the Tower, *ib.*; finds himself necessitated to release them, as well as Lord Arundel, *ib.*; dissolves his second parliament, 18; and places Bristol and Arundel under arrest, *ib.*; nature of the difficulties in which he now found himself involved, *ib.*; orders a fresh loan to be raised, *ib.*; calls a third parliament, 21; his address to it, *ib.*; the infatuation of the principles on which he proceeded, 22; his address to the council on the occasion of a subsidy being announced, 23; takes umbrage at the commons insisting in the first instance upon a redress of grievances, 24; assures parliament of his determination to maintain all the national rights, but not to be interfered with in his own, *ib.*; returns an evasive answer to the petition of rights, 27; forbids the house of commons to meddle in affairs of state, *ib.*; modifies this intimation, 28; sanctions the bill of rights, 29; prorogues parliament, 30; effect which the murder of the Duke of Buckingham produced upon him, *ib.*; adopts measures of the

most despotic character, *ib.*; his position at this juncture, *ib.*; his attempts to obtain the concession of the tonnage and poundage dues, 81; his differences with the commons in consequence, 83; dissolves his third parliament, 83; his proclamation on the occasion, *ib.*; perfidious character of the career in which he was now embarked, 84; the nature of his views at this time, *ib.*; concludes peace with France, 86; and with Spain, *ib.*; effect of his particular class of despotism upon the nation at large, at this period, *ib.*; his position with reference to his wife's favourites, 87; his subjection to Henrietta Maria, *ib.*; his domestic character, *ib.*; his councillors at this period, 88; his attachment to them, 41; his exalted idea of the rights of royalty, 42; his moderation towards the Roman Catholics, 48; the inflexibility of his pride, 44; becomes involved in pecuniary difficulties, *ib.*; forbids Strafford to call the Irish parliament, 45; character and effects of his tyranny, *ib.*; resorts to all sorts of illegal and oppressive methods for raising money, 46; reintroduces long since abandoned monopolies, *ib.*; extends the royal forests, 47; attempts to conciliate the aristocracy, 48; imposes heavy fines for slights exhibited towards the nobility, and shares the produce with the offended party, *ib.*; resorts for support to the Anglican clergy, 49; encourages the most arrogant pretensions on the part of the bishops, 54; interposes to prevent the emigration of sectaries, 60; succeeds in defeating Hampden in the court of law, 67; his endeavours to establish episcopacy in Scotland, 68; orders the introduction there of an Anglican liturgy, 70; is determinately resisted in the attempt, *ib.*; sends the Marquis of Hamilton to Edinburgh to carry out his purposes, 72; prepares for war with Scotland, 73; despatches an army towards Edinburgh, 74; proceeds himself to York, *ib.*; concludes a pacification with the Scots, 75; levies another army against Scotland, 76; sends for Strafford, *ib.*; summons a new parliament in England, 77; lays the letter of the Scots to the

King of France before it, and announces his determination of renewing the war, 78; demands subsidies, *ib.*; has warm disputes with his new house of commons, 79; offers, on certain conditions, to give up all future demands for ship money, *ib.*; dissolves the parliament, 80; after futile regrets for taking this step, returns to despotism, *ib.*; has resort to oppressive and illegal means of raising money, and renews his persecution of popular members of parliament, 81; departs with Strafford for the army assembled on the Border, 82; assembles at York, the great council of the peers of the kingdom, 84; assembles his fifth parliament, 85; nature of his address to it, 86; summons Strafford to attend him, 89; his address to parliament on the occasion of the proposed triennial bill, 93; opens negotiations with the Earl of Bedford and his friends, 97; forms a new privy council, *ib.*; has interviews with some of the malcontents of the army, 99; signs a petition of a threatening nature to parliament prepared by them, *ib.*; his attempts to save Strafford, 104; he announces that he will never consent to the earl's death, 106; his interview with Holles on the subject, 108; he consents to the bill condemning Strafford, 107; takes his departure for Scotland, 112; his attempts to gain over the army, 113; his arrival in Edinburgh, *ib.*; his concessions to the Scottish parliament and church, *ib.*; his affair with Hamilton and Argyle, *ib.*; his real design in visiting Scotland and plans in concert with Montrose, 114; leaves the responsibility of quelling the Irish rebellion to parliament, 115; his expectations from that rebellion, *ib.*; returns to London, 121; his reception on his way and on his arrival, *ib.*; entertains the corporation of London at dinner, *ib.*; withdraws from parliament the guard assigned it by Essex, *ib.*; his efforts to rally a party around him, 123; engages Hyde, Colepepper, and Lord Falkland in his immediate service, *ib.*; his indignation and fear at the popular excitement which now arose, 127;

attempts to intimidate parliament, *ib.*; adopts the declaration of the twelve bishops, nullifying the proceedings in parliament during their absence, 128; affects to give way to the parliament, 129; rejects the application of the house of commons for a guard, *ib.*; has Lord Kimbolton and five members of the commons impeached for high treason, *ib.*; sends a serjeant-at-arms to arrest the latter, 131; proceeds to the house to take the accused into custody himself, 132; his speech on the occasion, *ib.*; his affliction at the failure of this attempt, 134; demands the accused at the hands of the city authorities without effect, 135; his position at this juncture, 136; retires to Hampton Court, 137; prepares for war, 138; proceeds to Windsor, *ib.*; his negotiations with the parliament for the purpose of gaining time, 139; authorizes the bill for excluding the bishops from parliament, 142; proceeds to Dover, *ib.*; has several interviews there, at Canterbury, at Theobalds, and at Newmarket, with commissioners from the commons, 143, 144; details of these conferences, *ib.*; proceeds to York, 145; his appeals to the people, 149; their effect, *ib.*; he gains ground, 150; his attempt upon Hull, 151; orders, without effect, the Westminster assizes to be held at York, 152; his unsuccessful attempt to dismiss the parliamentary commissioners deputed to observe his proceedings, 153; proceeds to levy a guard, *ib.*; is defeated in the attempt, 154; his differences with the royalist refugees from parliament, 155; the difficulties in which he now found himself involved, *ib.*; commissions the principal royalists to raise troops in his name, *ib.*; the indecision of his proceedings, *ib.*; essays to raise money by voluntary contribution, but with little effect, 157; breaks off a commenced negotiation with the parliament, 159; takes active measures for carrying on the impending war, 161; makes a progress through Yorkshire and other counties, 162; erects the royal standard at Nottingham, *ib.*; establishes his head-quarters at Shrewsbury, 163; advances

towards London, 164; is defeated by Essex at Edgehill, 166; establishes his head-quarters at Oxford, 167; obtains possession of Banbury and other places, *ib.*; receives commissioners from the parliament at Colnbroek, 168; defeats Holles' regiment, 169; occupies Brentford, *ib.*; retreats to Reading, and then to Oxford, 170; receives a deputation from the common council, 171; receives commissioners from the parliament at Oxford, 178; his rejection of their proposals, 179; sends a message to Hampden, 188; is rejoined by Henrietta-Maria, 192; declares the two houses at Westminster not to be a true parliament, and forbids his subjects to obey their orders, 193; publishes a more modified proclamation, 194; the plan he had formed for marching upon London, 199; sends to Lord Newcastle on the subject, *ib.*; relinquishes the enterprise, 200; besieges Gloucester, *ib.*; his interview with deputies from that city, 201; sends a messenger to Essex with proposals of peace, 202; raises the siege, *ib.*; engages Essex at Newbury, 203; retires to Oxford, *ib.*; his reception of the lords who had withdrawn from parliament, 218; excites unpopularity among the nobility by taking part against their claims with Prince Rupert, *ib.*; receives intelligence that the Scots are preparing to make war upon him, 219; sends the Duke of Hamilton to Edinburgh with large offers, *ib.*; his intrigues with the Irish discovered, 220; progress of his affairs in Ireland, 221; signs a year's truce with the Irish rebels, and recalls the English troops sent to repress them, 222; indignation of all classes at his conduct on this occasion, *ib.*; his interview with Hyde respecting the parliament at Westminster, 223; desires a proclamation to be drawn up dissolving it, *ib.*; abandons the project, 224; his objection to calling a parliament at Oxford, *ib.*; but assents to the proposition, 225; his feeling with regard to war, 227; is induced to write to the parliament at Westminster, to propose negotiations, 228; adjourns the assembly at Ox-

ford, 229; his feeling towards it, *ib.*; quits Oxford and makes his way unperceived between the two camps besieging the city, 232; resumes the offensive, 284; defeats Waller at Cropredy Bridge, *ib.*; advances into the west to attack Fairfax, *ib.*; but sends at the same time a letter to parliament, offering to treat, *ib.*; writes to Essex, 240; sanctions a second letter to Essex from Lord Wilmot and others, 241; compels Essex to quit his army, and the army itself to capitulate, 242; addresses another pacific message to the house, 244; resolves to march upon London, *ib.*; issues a proclamation, calling upon his subjects to rise in his favour, *ib.*; is defeated by Lord Manchester at Newbury, 245; receives commissioners at Oxford from the parliament, 250; his first public interview with them, 251; his private interview with Holles and Whitelocke, *ib.*; his second public interview with the commissioners, 253; sends a message to parliament, 254; agrees to a conference at Uxbridge, 255; restores the name of parliament to the houses at Westminster, 260; gives audience to Lord Southampton at Oxford, 262; sends Prince Charles into the west of England with the title of generalissimo, 269; his despondency at this period, *ib.*; quits Oxford for the north of England, 271; takes Leicester, 272; is defeated by Fairfax at Naseby, 273; his private correspondence read to the citizens of London in Guildhall, 277; proceeds to Ragland Castle, 281; his letter to Prince Rupert, 282; takes up his head-quarters at York, *ib.*; returns to Oxford, 283; marches against the Scots, 284; returns to Ragland Castle, *ib.*; his letter to Prince Rupert respecting the surrender of Bristol, *ib.*; deprives the prince and Colonel Legge of their commissions, 285; is defeated by the parliamentarians at Rounton Heath, 286; proceeds to Newark, 287; his interview with Prince Rupert, 288; dissensions between him and Sir Richard Willis and other royalists, *ib.*; escapes to Oxford, 290; despondent of his affairs, *ib.*; makes overtures of peace, 291; renews them,

294; his secret negotiations with the Irish Roman catholics discovered, *ib.*; their nature, *ib.*; disavows his agents in those negotiations, but without effect, 295; his position at this time, *ib.*; his endeavours to sow dissensions among his opponents, 297; his correspondence with Vane, *ib.*; proceeds to the Scottish camp, 300; his reception, 301; his secret plans with Lord Digby, 306; writes to Lord Ormond, *ib.*; his controversy on religion with Henderson, 307; writes to Lord Glamorgan, to raise money for him by pawning the kingdom, *ib.*; continues his negotiations with the Irish Roman Catholics, *ib.*; receives commissioners from the parliament, *ib.*; his interviews with de Montreuil and Davenant, 308; declines the parliamentary propositions, 309; receives a deputation from Edinburgh, 312; his letter to Hamilton respecting his position, 313; increasing sympathy of the people for him, 315; is given up by the Scots and conveyed to Holmby Castle, 316; his reception by the people on his way, and on his arrival, *ib.*; his treatment by the parliamentary commissioners, 325; is removed by the army to Newmarket, *ib.*; details of the affair, 326; receives Fairfax and his staff at Childersley, 329; his treatment by the army, 334; his interview with his youngest children at Maidenhead, 335; his friendly intercourse with the leaders of the army, *ib.*; his first interview with Sir John Berkley, 337; differences between him and the officers, 341; addresses proposals to them, *ib.*; removes to Hampton Court, 348; his renewed intercourse with Cromwell and other leaders of the army, *ib.*; rejects proposals made by parliament, 351; his secret correspondence with the royalists, 352; a letter from him to the queen discovered by Cromwell, 353; rigorous measures adopted towards him by the army, 357; consults William Lilly as to a place of retreat, 359; escapes from Hampton Court to the Isle of Wight, *ib.*; attempts to renew his negotiations with the army, 367; his secret hopes, 368; receives commissioners from the parliaments of

- Scotland and England, at Carisbrook, 389; concludes a treaty with the former, *ib.*; rejects the propositions of the latter, 370; his interview with Col. Hammond respecting the rigorous treatment applied to him, 370; manifestations in his favour throughout the country, 376 *et seq.*; receives commissioners from the parliament at Newport, 394; his double-dealing on the occasion, 396; his firmness with reference to the church of England, 398; his touching farewell to the parliamentary commissioners, 401; is removed to Hurst Castle, 403; and thence to Windsor, 411; his conversation on the way with Major Harrison, 413; dines at Lord Newburgh's, 414; arrival at Windsor, *ib.*; his treatment there, *ib.*; is removed to London, 418; appears before the high court of commission, 419; particulars of the first day's trial, *ib.*; of the second, 421; of the third, 422; steps taken in his behalf, *ib.*; his fourth appearance before the court, 423; is condemned to death, 426; his demeanour after sentence, *ib.*; his interview next day with Juxon, 428; and with his two youngest children, 429; his conduct on the day of his execution, 431; his speech on the scaffold, 434; his death and funeral, 438.
- Charles, Prince of Wales, appointed by his father generalissimo of the west, 269; offers to mediate between the king and the parliament, 292; retires to Seilly, 296; assumes the command of the mutinied parliamentary navy, 381.
- Chester, siege of, raised by the king, 272.
- Cholmondeley, Sir H., negotiates with the queen, 177.
- Church of England, its position immediately after the Reformation, 8; circumstances connecting it with despotism, 9; its position in the latter part of the reign of Elizabeth, and under James and Charles, 49; its independence asserted by Dr. Bancroft, *ib.*; its support of absolutism, 40; its assertion of divine right for the bishops, 54; its encroachments upon civil affairs, 55; the feeling of the country towards it, 58; its clergy take an oath against alterations in its government, 51; decline of its influence, 110.
- Church property, act passed authorizing the sale of, 292.
- Church, reformation in, actively set on foot by the presbyterians, 208.
- Clarke, Mr. Edward, his speech in favour of prerogative censured by the house of commons, 12.
- "Clubmen," origin of this body, 279; their views and progress, *ib.*; treated with by Fairfax, 280; broken up by Cromwell, 290.
- Cobbett, Col., removes the king to Hurst Castle, 418.
- Coke, Sir Edward, prevented from attending the king's second parliament, 14; characterized, 22.
- Colchester invested by Fairfax, 364; surrenders, 368.
- Colepepper, Sir J., named chancellor of the exchequer, 194; appointed to attend Prince Charles into the west, 269.
- Commerce, its rise in England, 6; impeded by France, 29; benefit it derived from Land, 40.
- Commissioners from parliament wait on the king at Dover, 142; Canterbury, *ib.*; Theobalds, 143; Newmarket, 144; York, 153; Colnbrook, 168; Oxford, 178; sent to Scotland, 194; wait on the king at Oxford, 250; their reception by the people there, *ib.*; proceed to Newcastle to receive the king from the Scots, 315; wait on the king at Newport, 394; particulars of the conference, *ib.*
- Commissioners from the king levy oppressive exactions over the country, 47.
- Committee of grievances draw up a report, 118.
- Committee of safety appointed, 160; of the two kingdoms appointed, 230.
- Common council present a petition in favour of war, 193; present a petition for the more vigorous prosecution of the war, 272; present a petition against the army, 378; refuse permission to Goring to pass through the city with royalist succours, 384.
- Commons, house of, composition of, in the 14th century, 6; wealth of, in 1628, 7; their great advances in freedom under James I., 11; their attitude in the first parliament of

Charles I., 12; vote the customs for only one year, 13; their attitude on being assembled, 1st Charles I., 15; impeach the Duke of Buckingham, *ib.*; vote public rumour a sufficient ground on which to proceed, 16; appoint commissioners to conduct the impeachment, 17; two of their members sent to the Tower by the king, *ib.*; their projected remonstrance burnt by the hangman, 18; character and views of the house, (3rd of Chas. I.) 22; have a conference with the lords as to the rights of the subject, 24; insist upon a redress of grievances, 25; draw up the petition of rights, *ib.*; their proceedings in the matter, 27; are forbidden by the king to meddle in affairs of state, 28; present a remonstrance against Buckingham and against illegal collection of tonnage and poundage, 29; are prorogued, 30; proceedings on being re-assembled, 31; their resistance to the king's levying tonnage and poundage, 32; their position in the estimation of the public, 57; their composition, 4th parliament of Charles I., 78; their proceedings, *ib.*; vote against the lords interfering in money matters, 79; refuse subsidies, 80; their attitude on the opening of the king's 5th parliament, 86; practically assume the government, 91; raise money in their own name, *ib.*; vote an indemnity to the Scots, 92; negotiate for peace with Scotland, *ib.*; their powerful attitude, *ib.*; feeling of the majority in the 5th parliament of Charles, 94; send commissioners into the provinces to remove the crucifixes, images, &c., from the churches, 96; attend in a body the trial of Strafford, 100; press on the proceedings, 101; their plan for effecting the destruction of the earl, 102; rumour of the house being about to be blown up, 105; their position after Strafford's execution, 109; prorogue themselves, 112; send a committee to watch the king's movements in Scotland, *ib.*; alarm of the opposition at the king's proceedings against the covenanters in Scotland, 115; authorize the servants of members to come armed to the house for their protection, 126; apply to the king for a guard,

129; their proceedings on the demand being rejected, *ib.*; steps taken by them on account of the impeachment of the five members, 130; conference with the lords, 131; the reception of the king on his coming to arrest the five members, 132; their subsequent proceedings, 135; resolve that the kingdom shall be put in a state of defence, 138; their proceedings on the king's withdrawing from London, 139; send commissioners to the king respecting the militia bill, 149; prohibit freedom of discussion, 150; reject a proposition for disbanding the army, 178; send commissioners to wait on the king at Oxford, *ib.*; reject the pacific measures proposed by the lords, 196; make a declaration of their attachment to the house of lords, 265; propose to omit from Fairfax's commission the instruction "to watch over the safety of the king's person," 265; their violent measures to prevent the king from coming to London, 298; vote £100,000 on account of the Scots, 305; vote that the army be disbanded, 316; their reception of the delegates from the army, 321; their attempts to conciliate the army, 323, 333; pass a resolution against any member holding a place of profit, 322; vote new propositions to the king, 368; pass a resolution to set the king by, 373; pass a resolution in favour of constitutional monarchy and of peace, 379; pass a resolution in favour of fresh negotiations with the king, 382; vote new propositions to the king, 386; their debate respecting the king's concessions at Newport, 402; vote them to be satisfactory, 407; certain members of, arrested by Colonel Pride by order of the army, 408; their treatment, 409; further proceedings against presbyterian members, 410; repeal all the proceedings in favour of peace, 411; resolve that the king shall be brought to trial, 414; declare him guilty of treason, and institute a high court of commission to try him, 415; resolve to proceed with the trial of the king, notwithstanding the refusal of the lords to concur in it, *ib.*; direct an inventory to be taken of the contents of all the royal pa-

- laces, 417; abolish the office of king in England, 486; allow 500*l.* for the expenses of the king's funeral, *ib.*; declare traitors any who declare a successor to him, *ib.*
- Confederation of counties for carrying on the war, 178.
- Conyers, Sir J., appointed governor of the Tower, 142.
- Cook, Colonel Edw., consulted by the king at Newport, 402.
- Cook, Mr. John, appointed attorney-general to conduct the king's trial, 417.
- Cooke, Mr. Secretary, gives offence to the house of commons, 24; his speech urging subsidies, 25.
- Cornwall, the men of, their bravery and loyalty, 190; letter of thanks to them from the king, *ib.* (note); peculiarity in the landed property of, *ib.*
- Cottington, Lord, his subtlety, 48.
- Cotton, Sir Robert, his speech in favour of a redress of public grievances, 12; summoned to aid the king with his councils, 21.
- Council, great, of peers, called at York, 84.
- Council, privy, of a popular character formed, 97.
- Country gentry are ordered to keep on their estates, 48; characterized, 124; their feelings towards the presbyterian party, *ib.*; resort to London to support the king, *ib.*
- Court, the, its hatred of parliament, 35; its intrigues, 37; its animosity to Strafford and Laud, 41; its alarm at the proceedings of the commons, 88.
- Court, Northern, abolished, 94.
- Covenant, solemn league and, drawn up, 71; its purpose, *ib.*; its immediate acceptance, *ib.*; agreed to by the parliament of England, 205; its reception in London, 206.
- Credit, public, its origin, 91.
- Cromwell, Mr., received with great honours by the king at Hampton Court, 348.
- Cromwell, John, his efforts in favour of the king, 422.
- Cromwell, Oliver, his first public appearance in parliament, 31; prevented from emigrating by an order in council, 61; his early menaces against royalty, 34; nature of his part in the work of opposition in the earlier stage of his political career, 150; prevents the transmission of supplies to the king from Cambridge, 157; rise of his reputation, 181; his opinion of the parliamentary and royal cavalry, 183; raises troops in the eastern counties, *ib.*; his address to his recruits, *ib.*; his rigid discipline, *ib.*; his intimation to Lord Falkland on occasion of the grievance remonstrance, 120; his endeavours to gain over Lord Manchester, 238; his attack on Lord Manchester in the house of commons, 246; rising distrust of him on the part of the presbyterians, *ib.*; progress of his influence with the army, 247; his contempt for the Scots, *ib.*; his speech in favour of prosecuting the war, 255; his power over the troops, 268; quells a mutiny in his own regiment, 269; is continued in command, notwithstanding the self-denying ordinance, 270; defeats the royalists at Saltp Bridge and other places, *ib.*; continued in command, 271; again continued in command, 273; disperses the clubmen, 280; continued in command for four months, 292; is again continued in command, 295; tampers with Ludlow, 317; his influence with the army, *ib.*; encourages discontent in the army, 318; his tamperings with Ludlow, 321; meets the advances of Whitelocke and other members of the commons, 322; solicited by the parliament to re-establish harmony between it and the army, *ib.*; his solemn denial of any concurrence in the removal of the king from Holmby, 330; allegations against him on the part of two officers, *ib.*; his protestations of fidelity to the commons, *ib.*; repairs to the camp at Triploe Heath, and openly places himself at the head of the army party, 331; his reasons for keeping fair at first with the king, 335; his interview with Sir John Berkley at Reading, 338; characterized by some of the army leaders, 337; his machinations to create dissensions in the parliament, 342; source of his influence with the republicans, 346; circumstances which involved him in distrust with the army republicans, 347; his assiduous intercourse with the king at Hampton Court, 348; seeks to concil-

late Lilburne, 349; nature of his feelings at this period, *ib.*; offers made him by the king, 350; sentiments towards him on the part of the army, 351; difficulties of his position in Oct. 1647, 350; discovers a letter from Charles to the queen, explaining his real intentions, *ib.*; denounced by Lilburne, 351; project to assassinate him, 352; his satisfaction at the king's escaping from Hampton Court, 364; his energetic proceedings towards the insurrectionary troops at Ware, 365; his subsequent reception in the house of commons, 366; his speech against the king, 372; endeavours to reconcile the contending parties in parliament, 375; is close pressed by Ludlow, 376; suppresses a royalist insurrection in London, 377; seeks to conciliate the citizens of London, 379; proceeds to head-quarters to take decisive measures against parliament, *ib.*; is defeated in his immediate object by Fairfax, *ib.*; his conversation with Ludlow, on his position, 380; has an interview with some presbyterian ministers, *ib.*; takes Pembroke castle, 389, and marches against the Scots, *ib.*; defeats them at Wigan and Warrington, 390; is denounced in a pamphlet by Major Huntingdon, 391; enters Scotland, 398; has an interview with Argyle, 399; concludes a treaty with the Scottish royalists, *ib.*; is received at Edinburgh in triumph, *ib.*; returns to England, *ib.*; resumes his seat in the house of commons, 411; his speech on the motion for bringing the king to trial, 415; his excitement on the king's approaching to take his trial, 418; resists Colonel Down's interposition in favour of Charles, 425; his conduct on occasion of signing the king's sentence, 430, and on that of signing the warrant for his execution, 431; visits the body of the king in his coffin, 435.

Cropley Bridge, battle of, 234.

Crown lands, sale of, by Elizabeth, 7.

DALBIE, Colonel, mutiny of his regiment, 268.

Darnel, Sir John, his case, and that of his colleagues, 19.

Davenant, Sir William, his attempt to

induce the king to accept the offer of parliament, 308.

Delinquents, public, denounced by the commons, 88.

Denbigh, Lord, and other commissioners from the parliament wait on the king at Oxford, 251; resigns his commission, 267; waits on the king, with other parliamentary commissioners, at Carisbrook, 371.

Devizes taken by the parliamentarians, 290.

Devon and Cornwall, people of, form a treaty of mutual neutrality, 173.

Devonshire, Duke of, anecdote of his daughter, on her conversion to Roman-catholicism, 64.

D'Ewes, Sir Symonds, supports a motion for peace, 387.

Digby, his speech against the bill of attainder of Strafford condemned by the house of commons, 109; his share in the impeachment of Lord Kimbolton and the five members, 130; his enmity to Prince Rupert, 287; defeated by the parliamentarians at Sherborne, 289.

Digges, Sir Dudley, sent to the Tower by the king, 17; released, *ib.*; his speech on the occasion of the king's forbidding the house to meddle in affairs of state, 28.

"Directions for public worship," substituted for the Anglican liturgy, 259.

Dissent, its progress, 60, 61, 303.

Divines, assembly of, convoked, 184.

Dorchester surrenders to the royal troops, 191.

Douglas, Marquis of, declares for the king, 283.

Downs, Col., his attempt in favour of the king, 425.

ECCELESIASTICS, bill introduced to exclude them from civil functions, 95; different views respecting the measure 96.

Edgehill, battle of, 165.

ΕΙΣΩΣ ΒΑΣΙΛΕΥΣ published, 422.

Elizabeth, Princess, her interview with her father at Maidenhead, 335; her last interview with her father, 429.

Ellot, Sir John, sent to the Tower by the king, 17; released, *ib.*; his speech against Buckingham, 24; his speech on the king's forbidding the commons

to meddle in affairs of state, 27; proposes a new remonstrance against tonnage and poundage, 29; his death, 36.

Elizabeth, Queen, her policy with reference to the nobility, 8; her resistance to the principles of civil liberty, 11; asserts her supremacy over the church, 49.

Elyng, Mr., resigns his office of clerk to the house of commons, 417.

England, the crisis in which she was in 1643, 216.

Episcopacy, petition from London for the abolition of, 95.

Essex, inhabitants of, present a petition in favour of the king, 386.

Essex, Earl of, sent with an army against the Scottish insurgents, 74; withdraws from the court in disgust, 76; is appointed captain-general South of Trent, 119; grants the house of commons a guard, 115; appointed generalissimo of the parliamentary forces, 160; marches out of London at the head of the army, 163; defeats the royalist army at Edgehill, 165; besieges Reading, 180; his innate antipathy to the war, 181; decline of his influence, *ib.*; circumstances which retained him in command, 182; difficulties of his position, *ib.*; rejects proposals to open negotiations with the king, 197; relieves Gloucester, 202; defeats the king at Newbury, 203; enters London in triumph, 204; tenders his resignation, 206; withdraws it, 207; receives a message from the parliament at Oxford, 227; returns it, *ib.*; receives a second letter, and replies to it, *ib.*; besieges Oxford, 231; refuses to obey the order of parliament to resign his command in the West to Waller, 233; his successes in the west, 238; retreats into Cornwall, 239; difficulties of his position, *ib.*; receives a pacific letter from the king, 240; and a letter from some of the royalist lords, 241; rejects their overture, *ib.*; sails from Fowey to Plymouth, and thence writes to parliament an account of his disasters, 242; the reply of parliament, *ib.*; his resignation, 243; his death, 254.

Evelyn, Sir John, proclaimed a traitor by the king, 163.

Everard, John, his disposition against the army, 378.

Ewers, Colonel, appointed governor of the Isle of Wight, 401.

FAIRFAX, Sir Thomas, his early appearance in the cause of liberty, 153; his spirited conduct at Heyworth Moor, 154; his successes in the north, 161; defeated at Atherton Moor, 190; appointed governor of Hull, 194; defeats the royalists at Nantwich and Selby, 229; appointed generalissimo of the parliamentary army, 264; takes up his head-quarters at Windsor, 268; formation of his army, *ib.*; invests Oxford, 271; defeats the king at Naseby, 274; invests Bristol, 284; defeats Lord Hopton at Torrington, 296; blockades Newbury, 300; meets the king at Nottingham, 316; decline of his influence with the army, 323; calls a general council of officers, *ib.*; his anger at the removal of the king from Holmby, 328; waits on the king at Chifley, 329; addresses a threatening letter to the city of London, 333; appoints commissioners to treat with parliament, *ib.*; interposes to procure the king an interview with his children, 335; his reception of the city authorities, 344; appeases the mutinous troops at Ware, 365; his reception of Sir John Berkeley, at Windsor, 368; resists Cromwell's project of marching the army on London, 379; beats the royalists at Maldstone, 383; obtains possession of Colchester, 398; reception of members of the commons on occasion of Col. Pride's proceedings, 409; withdraws from the high court of commission, 416.

Fairfax, Lady, her interruption of the proceedings on the king's trial, 423, 424.

Falkland, Lord, his early devotion to literature, 56; his interposition on behalf of Strafford, 89; characterized, 123; appointed secretary of state, 124; characterized, 204; his death, 205.

Felton, John, assassinates the Duke of Buckingham, 30; his execution, *ib.*; copy of the paper found in his hat, Appendix II.

Fiennes, Nathaniel, his cowardice at Bristol, 191.

Finch, Lord Keeper, his insulting treatment of Prynne, 64; impeached, 90; is permitted to escape, 91.

Fleet, parliamentary, mutinies, 381
 Forests, royal, unduly extended, 47.
 Fortescue, Sir Faithful, goes over to the royal army at Edgehill, 166.

France, ambassador from, refuses to interfere in the king's favour, 430.
 Free inquiry, its progress, 8, 56.

GAMES, popular, prohibited, 384.

Gascoigne, Sir Bernard, condemned by Fairfax to be shot, but reprieved, 378.

German troops levied by Buckingham, 28.

Giles, Dr., sent by the king to Hampden, 188.

Glamorgan, Lord, characterized, 384; confidence reposed in him by the king, *ib.*; his negotiations with the English Roman Catholics, *ib.*; is arrested, 385; on his release, continues his negotiations, 387.

Gloucester besieged by the king, 200.

Goodman, Rev. Mr., a Roman-catholic priest, pardoned by the house of commons, 92.

Goodwin, Rev. Mr., offers his services to the king, 433.

Goring, Lord, discloses the plot of the army to Lord Bedford, 99; declares for the king, 161; defeated at Langport, 280; heads a royalist rising in Kent, 301; assembles a royalist army on Blackheath, 338; retreats into Essex, 384.

Gourney, Lord Mayor, impeached and dismissed his office by the commons, 156.

Great seal, transmitted by the lord chancellor to the king at York, 152; replaced by the commons, 192; a new one made, 436.

Grenville, Mr., fined for speaking ill of Lord Suffolk, 48, (note.)

Grey of Wark, Lord, refusing to act as commissioner from the parliament of Scotland, is sent to the Tower, 194.

Grievances, report on, presented by the presbyterians, 118; debate on, 119.

Grimstone, Major, his attack on Cromwell in the commons, 330.

HACKER, Col., signs the king's death warrant, 431.

Hall, Bishop, his treatise on the divine right of bishops, 54.

Hamilton, Marquis of, opens negotiations with the political leaders, 97; affair between him and the king at Edinburgh, 113; is created duke, 114; sent

by the king to prevent a union between the parliaments of Scotland and England, 219; released from prison, 312; regains the king's favour, *ib.*; his exertions for the king, *ib.*; leads a royalist army against the parliamentary forces, 337; is defeated, 390; retreats into Wales, *ib.*; surrenders to Lambert, 391.

Hammond, Col., appointed governor of the Isle of Wight, 358; his interview with Berkley and Ashburnham, 360; waits on the king at Titchfield, 361; escorts him to Carisbrook Castle, 362; reports his arrival to parliament, 364; his angry interview with the king, 370; deprived of his command, 401.

Hampden, John, prevented from emigrating by an order in council, 61, characterized, *ib.*; refuses to pay ship money, *ib.*; brings the question before the judges, *ib.*; loses the trial, 67, his popularity, *ib.*; his views with reference to episcopacy, 97; moves that the remonstrance on grievances be presented, 121; impeached by the king, 129; wounded in a skirmish, 188; his death, 189; remarks upon, *ib.*
 Harrison, Major, escorts the king to Windsor, 413; his conversation on the way with Charles, *ib.*

Haslerig, Sir A., prevented from emigrating by an order of council, 61; moves the bill of attainder against Strafford, 102; impeached by the king, 129.

Henderson, Alex., draws up the solemn league and covenant, 71; his controversy with the king, 307.

Henrietta-Maria, Queen, her marriage, 4; her feelings towards England, 37; her ascendancy over her husband, *ib.*; characterized, *ib.*; her favourites, 38; her animosity to Strafford and Laud, 41; her conferences with the discontented officers, 98; returns from the continent with supplies, 175; her narrow escape at Burlington, 176; takes up her residence at York, *ib.*; enters into negotiations with some parliamentary leaders, 177; impeached by the commons, 184; joins the king at Oxford, 192; proceeds to Exeter, 231; embarks at Falmouth for France, 289; solicits permission to visit her husband, 422.

Henry VIII., his policy with reference

- to the nobility, 3, 7; his persecuting character, 8.
- Hertford, Marquis of, his disgust with the court, 190.
- Herbert, Sir Edward, attorney-general, impeaches Lord Kimbolton, Hampden, and others, 129.
- Herbert, Mr., his conversation with the king previous to his removal to Windsor, 412; instructions given him by the king after his sentence, 428; his last offices for the king, 431.
- Heyworth Moor, meeting at, called by the king, 154.
- High court of commission, instituted for the trial of the king, 415; its preliminary meetings, 416; opens its proceedings, 419; votes the king's condemnation, 423.
- High commission, ecclesiastical court of, abolished, 94.
- Holborne, Mr., acts as counsel to Hampden, in the ship-money case, 66; opposes the bill of attainder against Strafford, 102.
- Holland, ambassadors from, interpose in favour of the king, 480, and Appendix.
- Holland, Lord, his anxiety respecting the king's intrigues with the army, 113; deprived of his office at court, 152; his attempts to regain the king's favour, 218; returns to London, 222; rises in favour of the king, 384; taken prisoner by the parliament, 386.
- Holles, Denzil, characterized, 22; his interview with the king respecting Strafford, 106; attempts to save the earl, 107; impeached by the king, 129; his triumphant return to the parliament, 137; his interview with the king at Oxford, 251; proposes strict measures against the discontented soldiery, 323.
- Hopton, Lord, characterized, 191; accepts the commission of commander of the king's forces in the west, 296; difficulties of his position, *ib.*; defeated by Fairfax at Torrington, *ib.*; retires to the Land's End and thence to Scilly, 297.
- Hotham, Sir John, sent to the Tower by the king, 81; appointed governor of Hull, 133; refuses to deliver it up to the king, 153; arrested by parliament, 193; his trial and execution, 259.
- Hotham, John, executed, 259.
- Household, royal, expenses of, their increase under James I. and Charles I., 44 [note].
- Howard, Lord, arrested by Strafford, 83.
- Hudson, Dr., accompanies the king in his flight from Oxford, 300.
- Hull, summoned by the king, 162.
- Huncks, Colonel, his refusal to write the king's death warrant, 431.
- Huntingdon, Major, denounces Cromwell, 391.
- Hyde, Edward, his dissatisfaction at the king's dissolving his 4th parliament, 80; characterized, 123; enters the king's council, 124; prepares an answer to the general remonstrance, 127; draws up replies to the parliamentary publications, 149; joins the king at York, 152; opposes the king's proposal to annul the parliament at Westminster, 223; appointed to attend prince Charles into the West, 269.
- IMPRESSMENT, house of commons pass a resolution against, 122.
- Inchiquin, Lord, goes over to the king, 378.
- Independents, sect of, their rise and persecution, 60.
- Independents, party of, their rise, 213; their principles, *ib.*; their triumphant position after the battle of Marston Moor, 237; their progress, 264; their arrangements for securing the army, *ib.*; their anxiety to get the king from out of the hands of the Scots, 303; eminent men enrolled beneath their banners, *ib.*; their attempts to excite the people against the Scots, 305; their indignation at the Scottish demands, 310; temporary decline of their influence, 317; their efforts to relieve their position, 343; gain over some of the presbyterian members, *ib.*; their restoration to power, 344; difficulties of their position, 355; their leaders meet and resolve upon strong measures against the presbyterians, 408.
- Industry, its progress under Chas. I., 86.
- Infanta of Spain, mention of her projected marriage with Charles I., 4.
- Ingoldsby, Col., compelled by Cromwell and others to sign the king's sentence, 430.
- Innovation, political and religious, its marked advance towards the end of 1643, 214.

INDEX.

Ireland, its progress under Strafford, 40 ;
Breaking out of the Roman-catholic
insurrection, 118 ; its progress, 220.

Ireland, parliament of, votes subsidies to
the king, 81.

Irish Roman catholics, treaty between
them and the king discovered, 293 ;
conditions of the treaty, *ib.*

Irish Roman catholic insurgents, their
negotiations with the king, 220 ; make
a truce with him, 222 ; the hostility of
the people of England towards them,
ib. ; enlist in the king's army, 223 ;
women found among them, *ib.*

Irish royalists in England, rigours exer-
cised towards them by the parliament,
292.

Ireton, H., characterized, 318 ; keeps on
terms with the king, 335 ; his assiduous
intercourse with the king at Hampton
Court, 348 ; is offered by the king the
government of Ireland, 350 ; his
speech against the king, 372.

Ireton, Mrs., received with great honour
by the king at Hampton Court, 348.
Islip Bridge, battle of, 270.

JAMES I., his policy characterized, 2, 3 ;
his resistance to civil liberty, 10 ; his
policy with reference to the church,
50.

Jermyn, Henry, his intrigues with the
discontented officers, 98.

Jenkins, Mr. Justice, his dealings with
Lilburne in the Tower, 350.

Jewels, crown, sold by the queen, 155.

Joyce, Cornet, removes the king from
Holmby, 325 ; vindicates himself to
Fairfax, 329.

Judges, their subserviency to the court,
17, 19, 47 ; declare Strafford guilty of
high treason, 106.

Juries, their subserviency under Henry
VIII. and his immediate successors.

Juxon, Bishop of London, appointed high
treasurer, 41 ; advises the king to save
Strafford, 107 ; attends the king after
his sentence, 428 ; and previous to his
execution, 431 *et seq.*

KENT, petition from, in favour of the
king and church, 149 ; royalist move-
ments in, 381.

Kilkenny, insurrectionary council of, 221.

Kilgrew, Sir H., his answer to the pro-
posal for raising money among the

members of parliament to carry on
the war, 156.

Kilsyth, battle of, 283.

Kingston, attempt upon, by the royalists,
138.

Kimbolton, Lord, impeached, 129.

Kirton, Mr., takes part in the debate on
the king's forbidding the house to
meddle in affairs of state, 28.

LAMBERT, John, characterized, 318,

Langdale M., surprises Berwick, 381 ; de-
feated by Cromwell, 390.

Langhorn, Major-Gen., raises the king's
standard in Wales, 377.

Lansdowne, battle of, 190.

Laud, appointed bishop of London, 30 ;
characterized, 39 ; his administration,
40 ; his moderation towards the ca-
tholics, 43 ; is offered a cardinal's hat,
ib. ; his efforts in favour of the church,
51 ; impeached, 90 ; his interview with
Strafford on the earl's way to the
scaffold, 108 ; executed, 258.

Lauderdale, Earl of, his offers to the king
at Newcastle, 315 ; proposes a mode of
escape to the king, 358 ; enters into a
treaty with the king in the Isle of
Wight, 369.

Legge, Col. W., deprived of the governor-
ship of Oxford by the king, 285 ; ac-
companies the king in his flight from
Hampton Court, 359.

Leicester taken by the king, 272.

Leighton, A., his condemnation voted by
the commons illegal, 92 ; his tri-
umphant return to London, 93.

Levellers, described, 346.

Leven, Lesley, Earl of, his reception of
the king at Kelham, 301.

Liberty, civil, its progress in England in
the centuries immediately preceding
Charles I., 5, 7, 8 ; circumstances
which had previously retarded its
assertion, 9 ; its progress in the first
half of the seventeenth century, 69 ;
circumstances promoting its progress,
57, 61.

Liberty, religious, its connexion with
civil liberty, 9.

Lilburne, John, execution of his sen-
tence, 65 ; his condemnation voted
by the commons illegal, 92 ; his tri-
umphant return to London, 93 ; his
indomitable character, 305 ; his high
opinion of Cromwell, 327 ; his re-

preaches to Cromwell on distrusting his intentions, 348; is visited by Cromwell, 349; encourages the mutinous troops at Ware, 365.
 Lilburne, Robert, mutinous conduct of his regiment at Ware, 365.
 Lilly, Wm., consulted by the king, 339.
 Lindsey, Earl of, mortally wounded, 166.
 Lindsey, General, recalled to defend Scotland against the royalists, 283.
 Lisle, Sir George, shot at Colchester, 328.
 Literature, progress of the taste for in England, 56.
 Littleton, Lord-chancellor, sends the great seal to the king, and joins his majesty at York, 152.
 Liturgy, Anglican, attempt to introduce it into Scotland, 68; abolished, 259.
 Livezey, Sir M., defeats the royalist forces near London, 384.
 Loan on the king's own account ordered to be raised, 13; its failure, 14; another ordered, 18; resisted by the people, 19.
 Lords, house of, refuse to sanction a vote of the commons respecting the customs' duties, 13; admit Lord Bristol's claim to his seat, 16; address the king not to dissolve parliament, 18; have a conference with the commons on the rights of the subject, 25; urge the commons to modify their views, ib.; their conduct with reference to the petition of right, 26; advocate the views of the king on the opening of his fourth parliament, 79; reject the bill for excluding the bishops from parliament, 95; have the independent sectaries to their bar and reprove them, 96; send commissioners to Scotland to watch the king's movements, 112; contention with the commons on the subject of the bishops, 126; menaced in popular petitions, 141; impeach some of their colleagues for absenting themselves from the house, 152; adopt peaceful measures, 194; several members of, join the king at Oxford, 197; reject the self-denying ordinance, 259; complain to the other house of the injurious language used towards them, 265; pass a vote of thanks to the Scots, 309; resolve to invite the king to Oatlands, 325; vote to set the king by, 373; vote a conference with the

king in London, 385; refuse their concurrence in the ordinance for trying the king, 415; abolished, 436.
 London, citizens of, riotous proceedings of, on occasion of the war with Scotland, 82; present a petition against episcopacy, 95; manifestations of, in support of parliament, 125; their reception of the king after the arrest of the five members, 133; present a petition for redress of grievances, 137; public meeting of, after the battle of Reading, 168; their energy in defence of parliament, 194; royalist negotiations with, 225; their feelings towards the parliament, 332; royalist movement of, 338; royalist declaration of, in favour of the king, 342; give way to the independents, 343; their sympathy with the king on his trial, 421 *et seq.*
 London, common council of, send a deputation to the king in favour of peace, 171.
 London, corporation of, called upon by the king to furnish twenty vessels for his service, 19; their reply, ib.; present a petition for the calling of a parliament, 84; invite the commons to a banquet, 226.
 London, women of, present a petition in favour of peace, which gives rise to a riot, 196-7.
 Love, Rev. Mr., his fanatic oration at Uxbridge, 261.
 Lovelace, Earl of, opens a correspondence with the independents, 217.
 Lowden, Earl of, his conference with Whitelocke and Maynard, 248; his intimation to the king respecting the covenant, 309.
 Lucas, Sir Charles, raises troops for the king, 381; is shot at Colchester, 398.
 Ludlow, Edward, characterized, 317; tampered with by Cromwell, ib.; his conversation with Cromwell, as to the position of the latter, 380; endeavours to put the army in motion against the parliament, 393.
 Lanford, Sir T., appointed governor of the Tower, 127; dismissed the office, 129; makes an attempt upon Kingston, 138.

Macguire, Lord, executed, 259.
 Mainwaring, Dr., promoted, 30.
 Manchester, Earl of, rise of his reputation

942.062/GUI



17936

